

NO AGREEMENT between
Scripture and Popery :

In Answer to a Paper, Intituled,
Roman-Catholick Principles ;
With Reference to
G O D and the K I N G :
Being a P L A I N
D I A L O G U E,
F O R T H E
Use of a Young Nobleman.

By the Author of a Collection,
I N T I T U L E D,
The C O M M O N - P R A Y E R - B O O K
The *Best Companion, &c.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for H. C L E M E N T S at the *Half-Moon,*
and R. M E R E D I T H at the *Star,* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1712.

No Agreement between
Scripture and Popery:

In Answer to a Popish Libel
Against the Protestant
With Reference to

God and the King

Being a Plain
DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

Use of a



By the Author of the Collection

INTITLED

The Common Prayer-Book

The Book of Common Prayer

LONDON

Printed by G. G. and J. W. at the
Printers of the Book of Common Prayer
in the Strand

TO HIS GRACE

J A M E S

Duke of ORMOND,

Lord Lieutenant - General,
and General - Governor
of Ireland, &c.

May it Please Your GRACE,

TH E Experience of Your
Condescending Goodness
to so Mean a Person,
back'd with the Sense of the
Highest Duty, gives me the
present Boldness of Intruding
upon Your Grace when so many

A 2

Weighty

The Dedication.

*Weighty Affairs require Your
Attention another Way.*

*The following Discourse was
drawn up into this Form for
the Instruction of a Young Lord,
whose Education Your Grace
had made Your Own Particular
Concern before it became Mine:
And I could not but think my
self Oblig'd, for Your Grace's
Satisfaction, to acquaint You
how I have Endeavour'd to an-
swer the great Charge Commit-
ted to me, in Teaching Him the
Principles of True Religion, toge-
ther with, and before, all other
Necessary Parts of Learning.*

*Of Your Grace's Pious Care
that Precious Souls might be
brought from Destructive Er-
ror to the Knowledge of the
Truth, as this Young Lord is
One*

The Dedication.

One Instance, so How many more may we hope to see, when through Your Industrious Zeal the Youth of that Kingdom, (which has had the Happiness of so Good a Governor under the Best of Princes,) will now be taught, in their own Native Tongue, what they are to Believe and Do, according to the Rule of the Best of Churches?

By such Religious Acts Your Grace's Honour is Enlarg'd and Exalted: And all Your other Noble Qualifications do not give You a more Excellent Name than These.

And may that Good God who hath fill'd Your Heart with such Zeal for his Truth, never Cease to give Your Grace all other Vertues which may Adorn so

The Dedication.

great a Member of his Church
on Earth, till you shall be
Crown'd with Eternal Glory
in Heaven. This is the most
Heartly Prayer of,

My LORD,

Your Grace's most Oblig'd,

Most Obedient, and

Most Humble Servant,

WILL. HOWELL.

P R E F A C E.

THE Paper, Consider'd in the following Discourse, Contains the Whole Sum and Substance of Popery. A Paper too it is, Compos'd with so great Art; and Recommended by so great a Shew of Scripture Proofs, that it is well fitted to Deceive Many. For Many there are so Simple and Credulous, as to Believe, that Such a Pompous Shew of Texts would not be Openly produc'd in Testimony of any Doctrine, if they did not afford some Solid Proof: Many are Idle, and will not be at the Trouble to Examine them: Many again are Ignorant, and know not how to do it. And from all These, what a Vast Harvest may be Gathered? Upon the same Prospect, no doubt, this Paper has been so often Printed. It first appear'd (at least the first time I saw it, was) in the Reign of King Charles the Second: And in that Reign it was Appeal'd to by my Lord Stafford in Vindication of Himself, and all Roman-Catholicks.

As

The PREFACE.

As soon as King *James* came to the Crown, it was Reprinted, and generally Tack'd to that Famous Book, Intituled, *A Papist Mis-represented and Represented.*

This was a Time, when Many *Temptations* might probably prevail with not a Few, to take all upon *Trust*; and to Perswade themselves, that they had made *no Ill Change* of their Religion, in going off from *It* to *That* which *Seem'd* so well Attested, and which did give them *Sure and Certain* Promises of *Worldly Benefit.*

At *this Time* All Hands were Necessary to Prevent the Growing Mischief. And this Consideration set Me to Work, tho' one of the Weakest Labourers in God's Vineyard.

Early in this Reign the present Discourse was finish'd, and shewn to divers Learned Men, who Approv'd of it, and gave me the Opinion that it might do Good in the World; upon which I Resolv'd to Publish it.

But before it was Committed to the Press, being well Inform'd, that some very Worthy Divines of *London* had begun to Examine all the Texts Pretended to by the Papists, I then Concluded, that *Their Work* might be a Just *Superfedeas* to the Publication of *Mine*, and so Reserv'd it for other Purposes.

Some time after, Mr. *Obadiah Walker* of *Oxford* was about to Print there a Book, to
Prove

The P R E F A C E.

Prove the *Agreement* of the *Romish* Religion with the Scripture. He went as far as the First Sheet, which then, with the Title-Page, was brought to Me. Its Title was, *An Appeal to the Holy Scriptures, in Vindication of Catholick Doctrine, and Confutation of Protestant Error.*

I soon design'd to Attack Him; and thought my self pretty well Provided for the Engagement out of this Magazine. But He drop'd *His* Undertaking, and so there was no Occasion for *Mine*. And God be Thanked, in less than a Twelve-month, Providence had Remov'd all *Apparent Danger* Threatned by Popery from *Within Us*.

This Discourse therefore was kept Dormant till some few Years since; when having a Young Nobleman Committed to my Care, whose *Education* had been always in *That* Religion, I Consider'd how I might make it most Useful for His Instruction in the *Protestant* One. In order to this, I chang'd it into Dialogue, as being a Way of Instilling Knowledge into Youth, the most Easy, Familiar, and Diverting.

I might indeed have sent Him to many Excellent Discourses of the Same Kind: But I Presum'd to think, that I could better Accommodate the Subject to his Use and Benefit than any Other.

And since 'tis now Judg'd by Some (to whose Judgment I ought to pay great Deference,)

The PREFACE.

ference,) that What is here Done for His *Private Use*, may also be of *Publick Benefit*, I therefore send it out into the World, in Hope of being the Instrument of a more *Universal Good*.

The Publication of it is intended for the Good as well of *Protestants*, as of *Papists*; as well for the *Confirmation* of the Former, as the *Conviction* of the Latter. And the Latter have as much Reason to take it in Good part as the Former, since Nothing has Mov'd me to *Seek Them*, but a *True Principle of Love*, and my *Heart's Desire*, (to which I joyn my *Prayer* also,) That They may be *Saved*.

And now I shall only *Advertise* the Reader, that whereas I have throughout the Discourse, for Brevity's Sake, made *Divers Supposals*, They are not *All* to be taken for *Affertions*.

~~I might indeed have said that I intended to make it most Useful for His Instruction in the Protestant One. In order to this, I changed it into Dialogue, as being a Way of instilling Knowledge into Youth, the most Easy, Familiar, and Diversifying.~~

~~I might indeed have said that I intended to make it most Useful for His Instruction in the Protestant One. In order to this, I changed it into Dialogue, as being a Way of instilling Knowledge into Youth, the most Easy, Familiar, and Diversifying.~~

~~I might indeed have said that I intended to make it most Useful for His Instruction in the Protestant One. In order to this, I changed it into Dialogue, as being a Way of instilling Knowledge into Youth, the most Easy, Familiar, and Diversifying.~~

THE

THE
CONTENTS.

SECT. I.

Of the Scripture and Church.

W hether the Church of Rome does well in not suffering Laymen to Read the Scripture? Page 4
Whether the Scripture can give Them Suffi- cient Instructions for Salvation? 9
Whether their Reading of it, and Judging by it, may be Superseded by that Attention and Submission, which is Due to the Church? 11
Of the Catholick Church. 18
Whether the Church of Rome be the True Catholick Church? 19
Whether She has the Marks, or Qualifications, of the True Catholick Church? 21
Whether She can Assuredly tell us, What Book is God's Word, and what is the True Sense and Meaning of it? 25
Of two Conclusions from the Premises. 30
How the Church proposes Matters of Faith. 33

SECT.

The CONTENTS.

SECT. II.

W Hether the Bishop of Rome, as Successor of St. Peter, be Christ's Vicar on Earth, and Head of the Whole Catholick Church?

35

SECT. III.

O F Absolution.	47
Of Satisfaction.	ibid.
Of Indulgences.	53
Of Purgatory.	54
Of Praying for the Dead.	68
Of the Merit of Good Works.	71
Of the Eucharist.	75
Of Communion in One Kind.	84
Of The Sacrifice of the Mass.	88
Of Image-Worship.	93
Of Praying to Saints.	100

No

No AGREEMENT between
Scripture and Popery:

In a PLAIN
DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A ROMANIST, *who calls*
himself Catholick,

AND

A CONVERT *to the Church of*
England from that of Rome.

In Answer to a PAPER, Intituled,
Roman-Catholick Principles, &c.

ROMANIST. WELL, Sir; you have now
left us for some Years, and
have had the free Use of
your Bible: Pray, tell me; have you found more
Scripture-Proofs for your *New Religion*, than I
have produc'd, in my Paper, for that good *Old*
One which you have *forfaken*?

B

CONVERT.

CONVERT. I have no farther *forfaken* That, than That has *forfaken* the Scriptures: And in nothing do I *Differ* from you, either as to Faith or Worship, but what is *New*; grounded upon the Sole *Invention* of Men, not the *Word* of God. For as to those Points wherein we *Differ*, the Scriptures produc'd prove Nothing indeed, unless it be *against* them.

ROM. That's Incredible: For then surely they would never have been plac'd here.

CON. If you would no longer take them upon Trust, but enter with me into a particular Examination of them, I doubt not to Convince you of the Truth of what I say.

ROM. Pray, try your Skill then: I am ready to attend you; and thus my Paper begins.

* SECT. I.

Of the Catholick Faith, and Church in General.

I. **T**HE Fruition of God, and Remission of Sin is not attainable by Man, otherwise than in and by the Merits of Jesus Christ, who (gratis) Purchas'd it for us.

II. These Merits of Christ are not applied to Us, otherwise than by a Right Faith in Christ.

* In the Paper indeed it is Paragraph I. But I hope, the Altering it into Section, will not be Imputed to Me as a Fault.

III. This

III. *This Faith is but One, Entire and Conformable to its Object; being Divine Revelations; to all which Faith gives an Undoubted Assent.*

IV. *These Revelations contain many Mysteries transcending the Natural Reach of Humane Wit or Industry.*

CON. As to these Four, I shall allow their Agreement with Scripture, because they are not only *Roman*, but *Universally receiv'd Principles*. But as for those that are of the peculiar *Roman* Stamp, I believe, we shall find them very Distant from the Sacred Lines of Truth.

ROM. What say you to the next then? *It became the Divine Wisdom and Goodness, to provide Man of some Way or Means whereby he might Arrive to the Knowledge of these Mysteries; Means Visible and Apparent to all, &c.*

CON. If we may with Decency say, *It became the Divine Wisdom and Goodness so to do; sure I am, we ought with all Thankfulness to acknowledge the Greatness of both in Providing for Man any such Way or Means*. But whatsoever these are, they will not bring a Man to a *Saving Knowledge* of these Mysteries without the *Illumination* of the Holy Ghost, which is a *Means not Visible and Apparent to all*.

ROM. *This Way or Means is not the Reading of Scripture Interpreted according to the Private Reason or Spirit of every Disjunctive Person, or Nation in Particular.*

CON. Yes, certainly, One very good *Way or Means* to come to this Knowledge, is to *Read the*

Scripture, tho' we may not *Interpret* it according to our *Own Private Reason* or *Spirit*. Your Church therefore does very *Ill* in *Forbidding* Lay-Men to *Read* the *Scripture*: And I believe all those *Proofs* in the *Margin* will not *Justifie* her in it.

R O M. The first is that of *St. Peter*, who *Affirms* of *St. Paul's Epistles*, That in them are *some things Hard to be Understood*, which they that are *Unlearned and Unstable Wrest*, as they do also the other *Scriptures*, to their own *Destruction*, 2 *Pet. iii. 16*. And do you not think now, that our Church does *very well* in *Denying* the *Holy Bible* to *Such*? Can you forbear to *Confess*, that in this very thing She is abundantly *Charitable* to their *Souls*?

C O N. What *Goodness* or *Charity* she has in her *Intention*, I will not *Presume* to *Judge*; but sure I am, she is *Sinful* and *Unjust* in *Doing* so. And what I say, may be pretty well prov'd even by this very *Text*. For *St. Peter* himself is here an *Undeniable Witness*, That *Such as these* had the *Free Liberty* of *Reading* the *Scriptures*. This is plain; because, if *those very Persons* had not had them in their *Hands* to *peruse* them at their *Pleasure*, they could never have *Wrested* them after this manner. And tho' they did it even to their *Own Destruction*, yet the *Apostles* did not think it *Good and Lawful*, either to *Take away* the *Scriptures* from them, or to *Forbid* their *Reading* of them; no, not in order to prevent so great a *Mischief*. For, then certainly they would have left some *Publick Testimony* or *Record* of the *Fact*, which might *Authorize* all succeeding *Pastors* to *Do* the same, and *Teach* the *People* to *Acquiesce* in it too: Then, I say, they could have
done

done no less than this, for the Benefit and Welfare of the Church in all future Ages. But no such thing appears: And therefore Your Church can never be Justified in *Denying* that to the People now, which was their Right when Primitive Justice ruled in the Church; and which none of the Apostles, notwithstanding their *Abundant Charity* to the Souls of Men, ever seem'd Dispos'd to Deny them, tho' they had the very same Reason also that she now pretends.

R O M. Hear then the next Proof: *There is a Way which seemeth Right unto a Man; but the End thereof are the Ways of Death, Prov. xiv. 12.*

C O N. This Text can be nothing to the purpose, unless you do prove, That the Scriptures are a Way *seeming* Right indeed but not *Really* so; and that the *End* of *Them* are the *Ways* of *Death*, even to such as Diligently, Sincerely, and Truly seek therein *Immortality and Life*. But I hope yet, none of you will ever attempt thus to *Blaspheme* God's most Holy Word: And so I demand your Third Proof.

R C M It is this: *Ye do Err, not knowing the Scriptures. Mat. xxii. 29.*

C O N. This was our Blessed Saviour's Answer to the Sadducees, who denied the Resurrection: In which having first charg'd them with that great Error, he Affirms it to arise, in a very great Measure, from their Ignorance of the Scriptures. And so the Text does evidently contain this Doctrine, *That one especial Way or Means for all Men to avoid Error, is to Study the Scriptures, and to Acquire the Knowledge of them.* And how can your Church

acquit her self of Guilt, whilst she prohibits so many the Use of this Means, which our Saviour himself has thus Approv'd?

But I would ask you another Question, which is this: Of what Rank and Capacity were these Sadducees? Were they Simple and Unlearned Lay-men? Or the more Subtile and Profound Doctors among them? If the former, then you will find, that even *they* had the *Liberty* of Reading the Scriptures: For saith our Saviour, *Have ye not Read that which was spoken to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, &c. v. 31.* But if they were the latter, then the most *Learned* may be found in the grossest Error, as well as the most *Ignorant* and Foolish. And therefore, if the Scriptures are *taken away* from the One for no other Reason but to *prevent* their Falling into Error, it must follow, that for the very same Reason, they ought to be *taken away* from the Other also. Nay, there is great Reason why the most *Learned* should be Depriv'd of them, rather than the Simple. For as the Danger of *Erring* cannot be too much *Prevented* in any, so the Occasion of it should be farthest Remov'd from *Them*, who when they have once taken up an *Error*, are most Able to Defend, and most Cunning to Propagate it. And so the best Provision that your Church can make against Error, will be to Establish a Decree, That All her Members (as well Clergy, as Laity,) shall lay aside their Bibles for Ever. But what's the next Proof?

ROM. *Believe not every Spirit; but try the Spirits, whether they be of God: because many False Prophets are gone out into the World.* 1 John iv. 1.

C O N.

CON. Here St. John is writing to all the Faithful in general concerning False Prophets; and gives them a Commission at large to *Try the Spirits*, lest at any time they should be Deceiv'd by such. But how could they know, which were of God, and which were not, without Examining their Agreeableness to God's Word?

And that the Word of God is the Rule, by which the People ought to *Try the Spirits* of the Prophets, is abundantly manifest. For when God gave Instructions to the Jews concerning this Matter, he commanded them to keep to the Law, and to the Testimonies; and told them, that they who did not speak according to this Word, had no Light in them, *Isai. viii. 20.* Again our Blessed Saviour requir'd the Jews to search the Scriptures; and told them, that by this means they might know, whether He was the True Christ, or a False one, saying, *They are they which Testifie of me. Joh. v. 39.* And lastly, when St. Paul preach'd up the great Doctrines of Christianity, we find the Bereans highly extoll'd above others, becaule they search'd the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. *Acts xvii. 11.* Methinks now, St. John, Back'd with these plain Texts, may convince you, That there is very great Reason why the People should be Earnestly Invited to, instead of being Deter'd from the Reading of the Scriptures.

ROM. Come, come; there is another Proof out of the same Chapter of St. John; and perhaps that may give us some better Light into this: *We are of God; He that knoweth God, heareth us; He that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of Error. ver. 6.*

CON.

CON. If your Church could prove all her Doctrines and Practices to be of God, as well as St. John and the rest of the Apostles prov'd theirs to be so, then indeed we should be most highly oblig'd to Harken to her; and our Dissent from her in any Material Point either of Faith, or Worship, would then shew us to have the Spirit of Error. But yet, we should not even then think our selves bound so far to Hear her, as to lay aside the Reading of God's Word, unless she could bring some good Proofs of the Lawfulness of this Command.

ROM. I see but one more indeed behind, which is this: *The Way of a Fool is Right in his own Eyes; but he that hearkeneth unto Counsel, is Wise.* Prov. xii. 15.

CON. Whether the Fool (of whom Solomon here speaks) be taken for the Ignorant, or Wicked Man, (for either may be understood,) certainly One very Likely Way, to Convince them both of their Folly, will be to lay open the Scriptures before them. For these do evidently contain such Instructions as are Sufficient both to Inform the one, and to Reform the other: And not only so, but to these likewise is ascribed a Power sufficient to do both. So the Divine Psalmist tells us, *The Law of the Lord is Perfect, Converting the Soul; the Testimony of the Lord is sure, making Wise the Simple.* Ps. xix. 7. and again, *The Entrance of thy Word giveth Light; it giveth Understanding unto the Simple.* Ps. cxix. 130. And if all this be true of the Law only, what then may be said of the Gospel, thro' which Life and Immortality is brought to Light? No less, surely, than that These Scriptures are Able to make every Man, as well as they could

could Timothy, *Wise unto Salvation*; that they are *Profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness*, till he is so *Perfect*, as to be *thoroughly furnished unto all good Works*. Were every Lay-man then one of *Solomon's Fools*, (which you must suppose to make this a *Pertinent Proof*,) it must needs appear, That your Church does very *Ill* in taking away the Scriptures from him, because She does also take away from him so great a *Means of Discerning the Folly of that Way* which is *Right in his own Eyes*. And if he desires to be *Wise*, or would no longer *Deserve the Name of Fool*, then he must *Keep his Bible*, and *Peruse it with Diligence*, instead of *Leaving the Heavenly Counsels* therein *Contain'd*. And so I leave you to *Judge*, according to the *Weight of these very Proofs*, whether your Church can be *Justified in this Particular*.

R O M. I must confess, that of so many *Texts*, I thought *Some at least* would have been more *Clearly on her Side*. But suppose now, That *All may Read the Scripture*; yet this *Reading of it* can never be a *Sufficient Means* whereby any *Lay-man may Arrive to the Knowledge of the great Mysteries of our Faith*, without an *Interpreter*. And unless you will allow every *Person to Interpret it according to his own Private Reason or Spirit*, he must look out for some better *Means* before he can *Know* what he is bound to *Believe* as a good *Christian*.

C O N. Those things surely, which are *plainly deliver'd to the Capacities of All*, need no *Interpretation*. And when we see a *Truth laid down in Clear and Express Terms*, we may *Know* it to be

be so, and *Assent* to it as such, without the Help of an *Expositor*. And so it is here: *All Divine Mysteries*, as far as we are bound to *Know and Believe* them in order to Salvation, may be found so *Clearly Reveald* in Scripture, that the Meanest Lay-man, if he were plac'd under such Circumstances that he had no other Way or Means to help him out, might by a Diligent and Careful Reading of it *only* (supposing him a Man truly Religious and one that humbly implores God's Assisting Spirit, he, I say, might) *Arrive* to a Competent Knowledge of the said Mysteries, and to an *Assur'd Belief* of their Truth. And this, I hope, I have sufficiently prov'd from the Texts last mention'd.

But now, tho' the Reading of the Scripture may be thus, *of it self*, a sufficient Means whereby a Christian may *Arrive* to a *Saving Knowledge* of all those Divine Mysteries which he is bound to Believe; yet there are Divers other Means for this too, as the *Hearing* God's Word Preach'd, the Consulting with Learned Men, Books, and the like. And they, to whom God has given such Blessed Advantageous Helps, ought not in the least to Neglect them, because they are Oblig'd to Use their Utmost Endeavour, that they may *Increase and Abound in Knowledge*, and in all Judgment. But I desire to hear now, what Means it is which your Paper doth assign.

R O M. It is an Attention and Submission to the Doctrine of the Catholick or Universal Church; Established by Christ for the Instruction of all.

C O N. That the Catholick, or Universal, Church was Establish'd by Christ for the Instruction of All: That an Attention to her Doctrine is One sure Means

Means of Arriving to the True Knowledge of the Christian Faith; by which Doctrine I mean what has been Taught in all Ages and Places of the World: Lastly, That we ought to Submit to Every Such Doctrine, I shall readily grant. But what then? Will this invalidate any thing that I have said?

R. O. M. Yes, surely: For then there is some good Reason, That All the Private Members of this Church should *Acquiesce* in Her Judgment concerning Matters of Religion, and not Presume to set up *their Own Judgment* against Her's, by Examining her Doctrines, and bringing them to the Test of Scripture.

C. O. N. Tho' you call this a *Presuming to set up their Own Judgment against that of the Church*, Yet it was not accounted so in the Days of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles. For, saith the former, *Why even of your Selves Judge ye not what is Right. Luke xii. 57.* And often in his Reasonings with the People, he sent them to the Law and the Prophets, that they might themselves *See and Judge* whether it was *Written* as he said. *Mark xi. 17. John x. 34.* St. Paul in like manner, bids them *Judge* what he saith, *1 Cor. x. 15.* And in another Epistle, *Prove all things: Hold fast that which is Good. 1 Thess. v. 21.* St. Peter also comes not far behind them: *We have (saith he) a more sure Word of Prophecy; and ye do Well to take heed unto it, as unto a Light that shineth in a dark place. 2 Pet. i. 19.* And indeed it was one *Uniform Doctrine* of the Ancient Catholick Church, * *That the People were to Read as well as*

* See the Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers concerning the Unity of the Catholick Church. Pag. 40, &c.

Hear the Scriptures, and to Judge by Them concerning those Doctrines which were taught in the Church. And now for your Proofs.

R O M. What think you of this? If he neglect to Hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen Man and a Publican, Mat. xviii. 17.

CON. This Text makes a great *Shew* at first sight indeed, but is *Really* nothing to the Purpose. For our Question is about *Hearing* the Church in Matters of Faith or Worship, whereas these Words do wholly Relate to some Matters of *Common Trespass*, or *Injury*, of which she was to be Judge between Man and Man. This is Obvious to any one that shall but read the Context, beginning at the 15th Verse.

But now, suppose this *Hearing* of the Church, may be extended also to Matters of Faith and Worship; yet certainly this should not hinder us from following the aforesaid *Divine Counsels*, of *Reading the Scriptures*, of *Proving and Judging* whether those things, which are propos'd to us to be *Believ'd* or *Done*, are *Agreeable* to the Truth of *Them*.

R O M. This is the next: *He that Heareth you, Heareth me; and he that Despiseth you, Despiseth me; and he that Despiseth me, Despiseth him that sent me.* Luke x. 16.

CON. All that can be justly interr'd fr'm hence, is this: That the People ought highly to *Reverence* the Pastors of the Church, and to *Obe*y every *Sound Doctrine* wick they Deliver; as also, That whatsoever they shew, either of *Contempt* to their Persons, or of *Disobedience* to *Such* their Doctrines,

Doctrines, it shall be Interpreted as Done to Christ and God himself, and be Punish'd accordingly. And what will this avail you? Surely you will not say, That to *Read* the Scriptures, and to *Judge Soberly* for our Selves, is to *Despise* the Ministers of Christ, yea, Christ and God himself: Nor can you affirm it to be Inconsistent with that Reverence, Attention, and Submission, which is Due to Them and their Doctrine. No certainly: For we have great Reason to Believe, that the People will *much more readily* pay all Due Reverence, Attention and Submission both to Them, and their True Doctrines, when *Reading* the Scriptures, they see with their own Eyes that God requires it.

R O M. Two Proofs more I find at the Close of this Article, whereof the first is this: *If there arise a Matter too hard for thee in Judgment, between Blood and Blood, between Plea and Plea, and between Stroke and Stroke, being Matters of Controversie within thy Gate: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the Place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the Priests and Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days, and enquire; and they shall shew thee the Sentence of Judgment.* Deut. xvii. 8, 9.

C O N. This shews indeed, that the Priests and Levites were made Judges amongst the Jews: But then surely the People were not bound to give over the Reading of the Law, or to Believe them in any thing Contrary to the Known Doctrine of the Law. And if the People under the Law had the Liberty to do this, why may not We now under the Gospel? And so let us examine the Other Proof.

R O M. *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses Seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you Observe, that Observe and Do, Mat. xxiii. 2, 3.*

C O N. I grant you, that as the Scribes and Pharisees *Succeeded* Moses, so do the Chief Pastors of the Church *Succeed* the Apostles; and that as the Jews were bound to Obey Them in all things which they Taught *according* to the Law of *Moses*, so are we Oblig'd to Submit to These in every Point which they maintain *according* to the Doctrine of the Apostles. But when the Scribes and Pharisees, who possess'd the Seat of *Moses*, did teach any thing that was *Contrary* to the Law of *Moses*, then the People were bound *not* to Observe them. For our Saviour gave them an Especial Charge *to Take heed and Beware of their Doctrine.* Mat. xvi. 6, 12. And so, according to this Parallel between the Scribes and Pharisees and the Pastors of the Church, it is very Manifest, That if *These*, who *Sit in the Chair* of the Apostles, do Teach any thing that is *Contrary* to the Doctrine of the Apostles, we must by no means *Hearken* to them. But now, how shall we Know when we are Taught that which is *Consonant*, or *Contrary* to the Doctrine of the Apostles, without *Reading* the Scriptures, and *Judging* by *Them* concerning it.

R O M. But I think, this ought to be Consider'd, which my Paper has laid down by the Way, *viz. That the Church was not only Establish'd by Christ for the Instruction of All, but also Spread for that End throughout All Nations, and Visibly Continued in the Succession of Pastors and People throughout All Ages.*

C O N.

CON. What your Paper here affirms of the *Catholick Church*, That we may also as truly say of the very *Scripture*. For *This* as it was Written, so it was *Spread* likewise throughout *All Nations*, and that for the *Same End*, even the *Instruction* of *All*. When *St. John* publish'd his Gospel, he design'd it for *All Nations* Spread throughout the World: And to *All* he made this Declaration, *These are Written that ye might Believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that Believing ye might have Life thro' his Name.* Joh. xx. 31. The same he Declares concerning his Epistle, *These things have I written unto you, that ye may Know that ye have Eternal Life, and that ye may Believe on the Name of the Son of God,* 1 Ep. v. 13. So *St. Paul*, *Whatsoever things were written afore-time, were written for our Learning, that we thro' Patience and Comfort of the Scriptures might have Hope.* Rom. xv. 4. And in another Epistle thus, *They are written for our Admonition, upon whom the Ends of the World are come.* 1 Cor. x. 11.

And as the Scriptures were *Spread* throughout *All Nations* for the *Instruction* of *All*, so it is certain, that for the same *End* they were *Visibly Continued* in the *Succession* both of *Pastors* and *People* throughout all *Ages*. For wheresoever at any time, the Church was *Visible*, there (your own Church only Excepted) *These* were *Equally Visible* to *All*. And if you Deny this, pray, Shew me but any one *Sound Part* of the *Catholick Church*, in which (whilst it so Continued,) the Scriptures were not as *Visible*, at all times, to the *People*, as to the *Pastors* themselves. From hence therefore it can be no more Concluded, that an *Entire Attention* and *Submission* is *Due* to the *Church* without a particular *Regard* to the *Scriptures*, than that the same

is Due to the Scriptures without a particular Regard to the Church. And so you may save your self the trouble of looking out any Proofs for this, unless it be for your own Satisfaction.

R O M. Pray, see what they are however. And that I may not be too Tedious, I will give you most of them together: *Ask of me, and I will give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the Uttermost Parts of the Earth for thy Possession.* Psal. ii. 8. *And it shall come to pass in the last Days, that the Mountain of the Lord's House shall be established in the top of the Mountains, and shall be Exalted above the Hills; and all Nations shall flow unto it. And many People shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the Mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his Ways, and we will walk in his Paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem: And he shall judge among the Nations, and shall rebuke many People.* Isai. ii. 2, &c. *And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldst be my Servant to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the Preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayst be my Salvation unto the End of the Earth.* Isai. xlix. 6.

C O N. These Texts indeed are an ample Proof of the Spreading of Christ's Church throughout all Nations, (for they are so many Prophecies of the vast Extent of his Kingdom here on Earth;) but still I do not find, in all of them, any thing that is Applicable to the Point in Debate.

R O M. There is but One more behind, which is this: *Ye are the Light of the World,* Mat. v. 14.

C O N.

CON. Let it be suppos'd now, that these Words were spoken of the Apostles only as *Representatives* of the Church; and that they are applicable to none but the Pastors of it, who are their Rightful Successors: Let it be suppos'd again, that these Apostles and their true successive Pastors, are *Lights so Visible and Conspicuous*, as to be *Discern'd* by every Eye, which is all you can desire: Yet we shall find many *False and Counterfeit* ones approaching so near to their *Likeness*, and appearing in such a *Shew of Light*, as it they were the very *Same*. St. Paul tells us, that these *False Apostles* and *Deceitful Workers* can transform themselves into the *Apostles of Christ*; that the *Ministers of Satan* will be transform'd as the *Ministers of Righteousness*; yea, and Satan himself into an *Angel of Light*, 2 Cor. xi. 13, &c. And our Saviour, speaking of such, tells us, That they should *shew great Signs and Wonders*, insomuch that (if it were possible) they would deceive the very *Elect*, Matth. xxiv. 24. And therefore, since as there have been, so there now are, and hereafter may be, such *False Prophets and Teachers* in the World, calling themselves the *True Lights*; so very like also to the *True* ones, that they cannot well be distinguish'd by the *Outward Appearance of Light* which they *shew*; and pretending *alike*, that they have *shin'd* throughout the *Christian Orb* ever since the *Sun of Righteousness* appear'd; it must follow certainly, that God has left the People some Means to *discern* the one from the other; some Rule to *Try* and *Judge* for themselves, by which of these *specious Guides* they may be most *safely* conducted to Heaven. And if there be no *Surer* or *Better Rule* and *Means*, (as I have shewn there is not) whereby they may do so,

than that of Gods own *Written Word*, then by *this* they ought to *Try* them both, before they yield a *Submission* to either. And so, if you please, you may go on with your Paper : For this Proof makes much more *against* you than for you.

R O M. *This Church is Guided in Truth, and Secur'd from Error in Matters of Faith, by the promis'd Assistance of the Holy Ghost.*

C O N. If by *this Church*, you mean every Society of Men professing the Christian Faith throughout the World ; then it cannot be true, that *She* is so Guided and Secur'd from Error, by the promis'd Assistance of the Holy Ghost. And this you must own as heartily as we do ; or else you must needs grant, that we of this Church and Nation, whom you acknowledge to have been once a Part of the Catholick Church, are not yet fallen into Error. But if by it be meant only some Part of that Numerous Company of *Visible Professors*, then I will readily grant you a Church so Guided and Secur'd, and own most of your Proofs for it to be Full and Pertinent. For there shall be at all times, in one Place or other, some certain *Professors* of the True Catholick and Apostolick Faith, whom God will so uphold by his Spirit, that they shall never fall from it ; and whom He will so preserve by his Power, that they shall never fail utterly from off the Face of the Earth, as long as the World endures. And so there is no need of Examining your Proofs for this.

R O M. And then I hope, you will as readily grant what follows, *viz.* That wheresoever this Church

Church has been, or now is, *From Her every one may and ought to learn both the right Sence of the Scripture, and all other Christian Mysteries and Duties, respectively necessary to Salvation.*

C O N. Your Proofs for this, I have already examin'd: And, as far as any Text of Scripture has in it a *Dubious Sence*; as far as any Christian Mystery is *Obscure*; and as far as any Matter of *Practice* remains *Undetermin'd* by the Scripture, I grant you, that in every such particular, *we may and ought to learn from none but the Catholick Church, Entirely Submitting our own Judgment to Hers.* But pray, what Church do you mean, by this *Catholick* or *Universal* Church, of which you have been talking?

R O M. *This Church thus Spread, thus Guided, thus Visibly Continu'd, in one Uniform Faith and Subordination to Government, is that Self-same which is term'd the Roman-Catholick Church.*

C O N. Ay; this is something indeed: And if you can produce but *one* Scripture-Proof for this, then I'll again lay aside my Bible, and humbly Supplicate, that I may be *Re-admitted* a Member of it.

R O M. My Paper has no less than Five, which are these: *My Dove, My Undeiled is but One, Cant. vi. 9. There shall be One Fold, and One Shepherd, Joh. x. 16. Now the God of Peace and Consolation grant you to be Like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus, Rom. xv. 5. And the Glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be One, even as we are One, Joh. xvii. 22. Fulfil ye my Joy, that ye may be*
Like-

Like-minded, having the Same Love, being of One Accord, Of One Mind, Phil. ii. 2.

CON. The Three last of these do only shew, *what Love and Unity* there is, or ought to be, in the Church of Christ: And from the Two first, All that can be inferr'd to your Purpose, is this, That Christ has *but One Church* upon Earth. And what then? Must it needs follow, that your Church comprehends the *Whole*? Surely, this great *Body* includes all those particular *Persons and Societies*, who are rightly *Baptiz'd* into the *Name*, and who adhere to the *Faith and Doctrine* of Christ. And your Church, in Drawing up such a *Bill of Exclusion* against all those that are not of Her own Communion, does contradict the plainest Testimonies of *Scripture*. For there we find *All Christians*, of what Place or Denomination soever, *Registred and Inroll'd* its *Members*. *St. Paul* tells us, *By One Spirit we are all Baptiz'd into One Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be Bond or Free*, 1 Cor. xii. 13. And again, *As many of you as have been Baptiz'd into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither Bond nor Free, there is neither Male nor Female: For ye are All One in Christ Jesus*, Gal. iii. 27, 28. And so, what you have shewn me yet, is far from a Proof, That your Church is the *Whole and Only True Church* of Christ: And considering how *Corrupted* She is, I think we are very Kind, in *Owning* Her to be a *Part* of the Church.

ROM. But, Kind as you are, my Paper shews, That these *Qualifications*, viz. *Unity, Indeficiency, Visibilty, Succession, and Universality*, are *Applicable to No other Church or Assembly* whatsoever.

CON.

C O N. And yet here is *not one* Text to prove that these *Qualifications* belong to Her, more than to any other Part of the Catholick Church. Nor is here so much as *one Word* of the *Most Necessary Qualifications*, the *Most Inseparable Marks*, and the *Most Essential Properties* of Christ's Church, *viz.* that *Truth of Doctrine*, that *Purity of Worship*, and that *Regular Administration* of the *Sacraments*, which His Church should constantly maintain; and by which chiefly a Church is Known to be His *True one*. But *these* indeed the Church of Rome cannot in the least *boast* of. Suppose however, that those mention'd were the *only Qualifications* or *Marks* of a *True Church*; yet they will be *All* found as *applicable* to our very Church of England, as to yours.

R O M. Pray, shew this in the First then, *viz.* *Unity*.

C O N. As to this, I could shew, That there are many *weighty Points of Doctrine*, about which your *own* Learned Men could never yet *agree* amongst themselves. But I will suppose you, for the present, to be at a *full Agreement* in all things. And what then? May not this *Unity* be as truly *applicable* to *Us*, as *You*? Yes, certainly; and it may be as truly *seen* among *Us* also. For we have *All the same Creeds*, and the *same Commandments*: The *Sacraments*, the *Service of God*, and the *Promises*, are *All the same* with *Us*: We do *All walk by the same Rule*, and *mind the same Thing*, *keeping the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*. And what more *Perfect* and *True Christian Concord* can you find in that Church of Yours, which *boasts* so much of *Unity*?

R O M.

R O M. Ay ; but you have *many Dissenters* both from your Faith and Worship.

C O N. And are you *sure* there are *none* in any of those Countries where your own Religion flourishes ? This you *cannot truly say*. Well then ; Will you *say*, That in those Countries where *such* are, your Religion is *not so Good*, nor your Church *so True* a Church, as in those where they are *not* ? This you *Dare not*. Why then must *Ours* be *less True* for this Reason, because We have *Dissenters* from It ? Was not the Church of Rome a *True Church* in the *Apostles Time* ? And yet there were Those which *caused Divisions and Offences*, contrary to the *Doctrine* which they had learned, Rom. xvi. 17. Did not Saint Paul call those of Corinth, the *Church of God* ? 1 Cor. i. 2. And yet there were great *Contentions* among them, ver. 11, 12. There were *Envyings*, and *Strifes*, and *Divisions*, chap. iii. 3, 4. *Dissensions* therefore, and *Divisions* there may be in a *True Church*. And that *Yours* has, as *Many* and as *Great* at least as *Ours*, is shewn in that *Excellent * Book* under-written.

R O M. The next *Qualification* is *Indeficiency*.

C O N. This indeed does belong to the Church of God. For God will *always have* a Church upon Earth, against which the very *Gates of Hell* shall never prevail. But yet, this is *not more applicable* to *Your Church* than *Ours* ; because *No*

* An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England: In Answer to those who Upbraid Her with the English Heresies and Schisms. By the Reverend Dr. Hicks.

such

such Promise was ever made to *Yours* more than to *Ours*, or any other Church.

But here let me ask you one Question: Is your Church the *same* now, that it was in *St. Paul's* Time, or not? If it is, then She has no reason to be so very secure of her *Indeficiency*. For *St. Paul*, then writing to the Church of *Rome*, does thus admonish her: *Be not high-minded, but fear: For if God spared not the Natural Branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee*, Rom. xi. 20, 21. But if it be not the *same*, then being *chang'd* from the Ancient Apostolick Church of *Rome*, her *Duration* can be no Argument of her *Truth*, tho' she should continue as long as the *Sun* and *Moon* endure.

R O M. The Third Qualification is *Visibility*.

C O N. Your Church indeed is *Visible* beyond all Contradiction: And if it will do her any Real Service, I will grant that She is most *Pompously Visible*, and full of *Grandeur*. But notwithstanding all her *Glory* and *Greatness*, notwithstanding her *Transcendent Pageantry* and *Lustre*, I do still affirm, That *Visibility* is no less applicable to our Own very Church. For to make a thing *Visible*, 'tis not necessary that it should be *Cloath'd* with *Gaiety* and *Splendor*. We do as truly see the *Blackest Cloud* in the Firmament, as the *Sun* it self with all its *Glittering Rays* of Light. The *Low Cottage* is as truly *Visible* as the *Lofty Palace*; and the *Meanest Peasant*, as the most *Glorious Prince*. In like manner, the Church of *England*, tho' you account her *Poor* and *Despicable*, may yet be *seen* (God be thanked) as well as the *Mighty Roman*. And therefore, if *Visibility* does certainly demonstrate a *True Church*, She also

ought

ought to share in the Advantage of this *Qualification*.

R O M. The next is *Succession*: And sure you will not contend with us in *this*.

C O N. Why, *Our Church* can shew *this*, as well as *Yours*: For *She* can prove the *Descent* of Her Bishops from the Apostles, with the very *same Clearness of Evidence*.

R O M. What? By *Deriving* it from the Line of *Our Bishops*.

C O N. And what then? Suppose *She* has no other Way to do it.

R O M. Then 'tis plain, That *Your Bishops* can be *no True Successors* to *Ours*, (altho' They were Ordain'd by *Ours*) because they have *Departed* from their Faith and Doctrine.

C O N. And then 'tis no less plain, That there can be *no Succession* of *True Popes* in your *own* very Church, because many Popes have *Departed* from the Faith and Doctrine of their Predecessors, and have maintain'd Errors and Heresies, for which they have been openly *Condemn'd*.

R O M. The Last *Qualification* is *Universality*: And I will say, You are very Bold, if you so much as pretend to it.

C O N. This *Universality* may respect either the *Number* of Professors, or that *Faith* which they profess. If the former only be meant, then indeed *Our Church* may yield to *Yours*, in
this

this Point without any *Dishonour*. For the *Truth* of a Church can never be well Prov'd by the *Largeness* of its Territories, or by the *Number* of its *Votaries*. What if the *Arian* Hereticks had once advanc'd their Numbers far beyond the *Orthodox* Christians, Would this *Universality* have made them the *Better* Catholics too?

But if this *Universality* be *Applied* to your Church with Respect to that *Faith* which She *Professes*, then I doubt not but our *Church of England* will make out a *much Better Title* to it; and be *Able* to shew, That the *Faith* which She maintains, is *much more truly Catholick and Apostolick*. For She maintains nothing as an *Article* of her *Creed*, and of *Necessity* to be *Believ'd* by every good Christian, but what was at first *most plainly* Deliver'd by Christ or his *Apostles*, and afterwards *Universally* Receiv'd by the Church: Whereas *Your Church* Denounces an *Anathema* against *All* those, that *will not Believe Many* things, which were *Never Taught* (to say no worse at present,) either by *Christ*, his *Apostles*, or the *Purest Ages* of Christianity for some *Hundreds of Years* *Succeeding*. And so let us proceed.

R O M. *From the Testimony and Authority of This Church it is, that we Receive and Believe the Scriptures to be God's Word.*

C O N. Very good: But sure you would have much Better, and more Certain Grounds for this Faith, if to your *Own* you would joyn the *Testimony* of *Other Churches*. And I am perswaded, That you would Believe much otherwite of the Scriptures than you do, if you would but Consult the *Constant Harmony and Agreement* of the

D

Catholick

Catholick Church in *All Ages*. But what says your Paper more?

ROM. *As She can Assuredly tell us, This or That Book is God's Word, so can She with the like Assurance tell us also the true Sense and Meaning of it, in Controverted Points of Faith.*

CON. And what Proofs are there That She can do all this?

ROM. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I Build my Church; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Mat. xvi. 18.*

CON. Your great and Learned Doctors do Contend, That by this Rock is meant the Person of St. Peter, and Apply it to the Pope as his Successor, telling Us, that He is the Foundation upon which the Church is Built. Now if this Interpretation holds good, then with what Assurance soever your Church does tell us *This or That*, She may be Mistaken notwithstanding her great Claim to this Promise. For if the Pope be not *Infallible*, as St. Peter was; then Neither can the Church, which Depends upon him, be *Infallible*: And if any Error prevail against the Foundation, it must also Prevail against Whatsoever is Built thereon.

That the Pope is *Fallible*, that He has been *Notoriously Deceiv'd*, is too well Known to need a Proof; and especially at this time, when your Own Paper acknowledges, that *It is no Matter of Faith to Believe, That the Pope is in himself Infallible, even in Expounding the Faith, if he be Separated from a General Council. Sect. 2. Art. 6.*

Now

Now from a General Council He has for many Years been Separated, (and for as many more perhaps may be,) and so, Whatsoever Points of Faith are Controverted, during his Separation from Such a Council, you have No Church in Being, which can with an Infallible Assurance Determine them according to the True Sense and Meaning of God's Word.

But to Answer in Short: Either the Rock and Foundation upon which your Church is Built, is the Person of the Bishop (or Pope) of Rome, Or it is not. If it is, then your Church being Built upon One that you own to be Fallible in himself, must consequently be as Fallible as He, and may be Deceiv'd in these things which She Tells you with so great an Assurance. And if it is not, then the Foundation of another great Article of your Faith is wonderfully Shaken, even the Pope's Supreme Headship over the Catholick Church, which is so much Grounded upon this Interpretation of the Text.

R O M. Hear the next Proof: *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* 1 Tim. iii. 15.

C O N. That you may the better see how little this also will make for your Church, I must desire you to Consider, Of what Church it was Spoken; Whether of the Catholick Church in General, or of any Particular Church. If the Apostle did affirm this of any Particular Church, then it must needs be that of *Ephesus*: For he wrote this Epistle to *Timothy* then Abiding in that Place. Ch. i. 3. And in this very Text he tells him, the very End of his Writing was, That he might Know how He ought to Behave himself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God.

And so if St. Paul did *Particularize* any, it was that in which *Timothy* did then *Reside*: and therefore, *not of yours*, but of *That only* he said, *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

But if this was spoken of the Catholick Church in *General*, then the Apostle could no more *Design* to *Point out your Particular Church* by it, than any *Other*. And so this Text may give us as good an *Assurance* of any other Church, *That She will not Deceive Us*, when She Declares, *What Book is God's Word, and What is the True Sense and Meaning of it.* And we Desire no more than this in *Favour* of the Church of *England*.

ROM. We are now come to the last Proof: *If he neglect to Hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen Man and a Publican.* Matth. xviii. 17.

CON. Tho' I have already spoken to this, yet I shall now add something more. And here let it be suppos'd for once, That this Church, which our Saviour Commands us to *Hear*, can *Assuredly* or *Infallibly Tell us*, *This or That Book is God's Word*, as also the *True Sense and Meaning* of the same in *All Controverted Points*. What of All this, I beseech you? How can This prove, That *your Church is Able* to do so, with the like *Infallible Assurance*? Can you make it appear, that our Saviour was now speaking of *your Particular Church*? If you cannot (and I am sure you *Cannot*,) then we have no Reason from hence to Believe, that *She will not Deceive us* in those things which *She Tells us* with the greatest *Confidence*. Had *She* indeed so good a *Witness* of Her *Infallibility*, as the *Word of Truth*, we should think it a Sin, without Repentance Unpardonable, to *Suspect* anything that *She Assures us of*: But we can
Never

Never Believe Her, when we see such Slender Proofs Produc'd to give Testimony in her Behalf.

ROM. Well : Waving the Proofs, that She *Can* do this, pray Consider the next Particular, *viz.* *How* She is *Enabled* to do it. You have it in these Words immediately following ; *The same Spirit that Writ the Scripture, Enlightening Her to Understand, both It, and All Matters Necessary to Salvation.*

CON. That the Holy Spirit of God *Can* so far *Enlighten* Her, I freely grant ; but *How* far he has *Actually* done it, must appear from your Proofs.

ROM. What think you of this ? *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, saith the Lord ; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for Ever. Isai. lix. 21.*

CON. These Words may be a Prophecy either of some that yet *are not*, or of some that *are already*, *Converted* to the Christian Faith. As they are spoken of the *Former*, I presume, you will not *Apply* them to your selves : And as they are spoken of the *Latter*, I am sure you have no more Reason than others to do it. For here is Nothing to Shew, that your Church has any *Peenliar Right* to this *Everlasting Covenant*, to this *Promise* of the *Spirit* from Generation to Generation. This therefore can be no Proof, that She is *now so Enlightened* : And the *Spirit* may be *Departed* from

Her; the *Light* that was *Once* in Her may be Nothing but *Darkness*, if you have no better Texts to shew that She is *Illuminated* from Above.

R O M. What say you then to this? *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall Teach you All things.* Joh. xiv. 26.

C O N. Had our Blessed Saviour indeed directed these Words to the *Person* of St. Peter in particular, then you might have had some *Colour* of *Pre- tence* to this *Promise*, by *Appropriating* it to Him, and by *Deriving* it from Him to his *Successors* the Bishops of your Church. But 'tis Manifest that he spake them to his Disciples in General, to *All* that were there Present, and without any Distinction. And so your Church can have no more of a *Just Claim* to this Promise, than any Other.

Besides; I doubt not but you will more clearly see in the Progress of this Discourse, That She cannot be so *Enlightened* by the same Spirit that *Writ* the Scripture. For if She were, She would not *Interpret Scripture Contrary to Scripture*; She would not *Require* those things to be *Believ'd* or *Done*, which also are *Contrary* to it: Of both which She will appear to be *Guilty*.

R O M. My Paper proceeds now to draw some *Conclusions* from the *Premises*.

C O N. Ay; but from those *Premises*, which are most of them so Apparently *False*, No Good *Conclusions* can *Rightly* follow. However, read them over; and if there be any Thing that deserves a *Remark*, I shall take notice of it.

R O M.

R O M. From these Grounds it follows, That *All and Only Divine Revelations, Deliver'd by God unto the Church, and Propos'd by Her to be Believ'd as Such, are, and ought to be Esteemed, Articles of Faith; and the Contrary Opinions, Heresie.*

C O N. Whatsoever God requires to be Believ'd as an Article of Faith, *That he has Sufficiently Reveal'd to the Catholick Church; yea, That the Church also has, and will in All Ages Maintain and Propose to the World to be Believ'd as Such.* And as *All That, and Only That,* ought to be Esteem'd the *Christian Creed; so the Contrary Opinions must be Accounted Heresie.* Thus far I agree with your Paper. But now if by the *Church,* none be meant but *your Particular Church;* then, I hope, it has already appear'd, and yet farther will, that This *Assertion* is altogether *Groundless.*

R O M. The next Inference is this: *As an Obstinate Separation from the Unity of the Church, in known declar'd Matters of Faith, is Formal Heresie: So a Wilful Separation from the Visible Unity of the Same Church, in Matters of Subordination and Government, is Formal Schism.*

C O N. As the *Faith* of the Catholick Church must be *always One and the same, throughout all the World;* So I grant, that in What Nation or Province soever, there is a *True Church Establish'd,* which Requires *Nothing* to be Believ'd or Done that is *Contradictory* to God's Word, *A Wilful Separation from the Visible Unity of That Church, in all such Matters, is Formal Schism.* And so, I know not how your Brethren, the *Roman Catholics of England,* can at all *Acquit themselves in this*

this Particular; Who have *Wilfully Separated* from *Such a Church, the Establish'd Church of Their own Nation*, for many Years past.

R O M. But pray, Sir, Was not the Church of Rome once the *Establish'd Church* of this Nation? And did not you first *Wilfully Separate* your selves from the *Visible Unity* of it? How then will you *Acquit* your own selves of *Schism*?

C O N. She was indeed once *Establish'd* here; and we first *Separated* from Her: But yet *We were not Guilty of Schism*, because *We could not Continue* in her Communion *without Sin*, She Requiring Us both to *Believe* and *Do* many things *Contrary* to God's Word. The *Guilt of Schism* therefore *She alone* is to Answer for, who *impos'd* such *Terms of Communion*, as no good Christian could Comply with.

R O M. How then will your *Fore-fathers* escape, who *Liv'd and Died* in a *Visible Unity* with Her? Or how shall *those* your *Present Friends* escape, who *Now* do so?

C O N. God, I hope, will *Wink at*, and *Pardon* Both, because of Their *Ignorance*. But surely *They who Liv'd and Died* in the *Times of Darkness*, and *Wanted Means* to *Discover* their *Errors*, will better *Escape* in the *Day of Judgment*, than *These, who Living* in the *Midst of so great Light*, have *Sufficient Means* to *Discover* them, and yet *Continue* in them, altogether *Neglecting* the *Same*. And I thank God from the very bottom of my Heart, that He hath *now* made me the *Member* of a Church, which allows me the *Free Liberty* of *Reading the Bible*, that I may See with mine

OWN

own Eyes God's Word Confirming Whatsoever She Commands me either to Believe or Do.

R O M. After these Inferences, my Paper tells Us, *The Church Proposes unto us Matters of Faith, First and Chiefly by the Holy Scripture, in Points plain and Intelligible in it.*

C O N. Very good: And we never will Deny our Assent to those Plain Articles of Faith, which any Church shall Propose according to the Scripture.

R O M. She does this, *Secondly, By Definitions of General Councils, in Points not Sufficiently Explain'd in Scripture.*

C O N. In this indeed She does very well: For General Councils have, from the Fathers who liv'd before them, sufficiently Explain'd and Defin'd all Matters of Faith Necessary to Salvation.

But certainly, there was a Knowledge unto Salvation in the first Ages of Christianity, before any such thing as a General Council was Seen in the World. And no Such Council there was till more than 300 Years after Christ, unless That of the Apostles be taken for General. However, as to All Controverted Points between Our Church and Your's, we are Content to have them Decided by those Councils which are most Ancient, Free, and General; and shall stand to the Verdict of their Definitions.

R O M. She does this, *Thirdly, By Apostolical Traditions, Deriv'd from Christ and his Apostles to All Succeeding Ages.*

C O N.

CON. We also Reject no *Traditions*, which you can prove to be *Such*.

ROM. But She hath yet another Way of doing this, *viz. Fourthly, By Her Practice, Worship, and Ceremonies, Confirming Her Doctrine.*

CON. This Way of *Proposing Matters of Faith*, I do not well understand. However, as we do not *Condemn* any *Practice, Worship, or Ceremony* in your Church, which is truly *Apostolical*, and of *Primitive Use*; So we do not *Retain* any in *Our Own*, but what is most *Undoubtedly Such*.

S E C T. II.

Of Spiritual and Temporal Authority.

ROM. PRAY, give me your *Opinion* of this *Section*.

CON. This *Section* is made up, for the most part, of *Negative Articles*; and endeavours to shew, That the *Papists* are not so *Bad Christians* and *Subjects*, as they have been generally taken for. But yet, most of those things which the *Author* of this Paper affirms, *They do not Believe*, or *May not Do*, are *Openly Maintain'd* and *Justified* by *Divers* of great *Authority* in your *Own* very Church. I need not shew this in *Particulars*, because it has been already done by *Many*. And for the most *Material Parts* of this *Section*, I refer you to the *Learned Answer to Stafford's Memoirs*,

Memoirs, * wherein they are Directly Confuted. My present Design is only to Consider those Doctrines and Practices, which your Paper does Own, and for which it Pretends *Scripture-Proofs*. And of these, throughout the *Whole* Section, I see but One that requires my Animadversion.

ROM. You mean this I suppose: *Catholicks Believe, that the Bishop of Rome is the Successor of St. Peter, Vicar of Jesus Christ upon Earth, and the Head of the Whole Catholick Church.*

CON. 'Tis the very same I mean to Consider: And though I should even grant you, *That the Bishop of Rome is the Successor of St. Peter*; yet by this *Succession*, no such *Supremacy* can be Devolv'd upon him, because *St. Peter himself* had Nothing Like it.

ROM. But here are *Several* Texts to prove it.

CON. And doubtless, when you have *Prov'd* the Force of them, you will find, that they All speak quite another thing.

ROM. This is the First: *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for Flesh and Blood hath not Reveal'd it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. Mat. xvi. 17.*

CON. *St. Peter*, in the foregoing Verse, had made an Excellent Confession, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God*; and hereupon our Saviour, in this, Pronounceth him *Blessed*. But *Blessed* surely he was to be in *Future Happiness*, in

* *The Loyalty of Popish Principles Examined, &c.*

an Heavenly Inheritance, not in any such Sovereign Power and Dominion here on Earth. And this Interpretation is Grounded upon the Plainest Scriptures: *Whosoever shall Confess me before Men, him will I confess before my Father which is in Heaven.* Mat. x. 32. *With the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation,* Rom. x. 10. But where can you find out so much as *One Text* to make good your Way of Construction?

R O M. Why; in the very next Verses, you will find two Such Promises made to St. Peter upon this Confession, as can imply nothing less than his Supreme Headship over the Catholick Church. And I believe 'tis only the Printer's Fault that they are not here, because our Men do All so much insist upon them.

C O N. Pray, read them out.

R O M. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will Build my Church.* Ver. 18.

C O N. I am well assur'd, that Many of the Fathers of the greatest Antiquity, Authority, and Learning, do by this Rock understand St. Peter's Faith and Confession, not his Person, But I shall make no Advantage of this, and Suppose that our Saviour did mean by it St. Peter Himself. Well; What will this at last avail you? Does it therefore follow, That the Whole Church should be Founded upon St. Peter Alone? Does it Exclude All the rest of the Apostles from being a Part of the Foundation?

R O M. No Roman-Catholick, I believe, will say so; but only, That He was appointed by Christ

Christ to be, next Himself, the *Chief Stone* in the *Building*, and that *All the rest* should *Depend* upon Him.

CON. But if we follow the *Judgment* of *Scripture*, we may easily Discover, That *St. Peter* was no more a *Rock* in the *Church*, than the *Rest* of the *Apostles*, and that *They* were *All Co-equal* in the *Foundation*. Let us hear *St. Paul* in the *Cafe*: *Ye are Built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner-Stone.* Eph. ii. 20. Here he is Discourting upon the very Point in Debate, shewing on Whom the *Church* is *Founded*: And this, no doubt, he does with the greatest *Exactness*, because it highly Concerns *All Christians* to be rightly Instructed in this Particular. But having mark'd out *Christ* as the *Chief Corner-Stone*, lo, he mentions *All the Rest* as *Equal Parts* of the *Foundation*. And if it had been *Needful* for us to *Believe*, that amongst either the *Apostles* or *Prophets*, any one did so *Excel*, certainly he would not have *Conceal'd* it. For this could not Consist with his *Fidelity* and *Sincerity*, who *Professeth*, that he had *Kept back nothing that was Profitable to the Church*, and that he had *Declar'd All the Counsel of God.* Act. xx. 20, 27.

Again, *St. Paul*, speaking of *James, Cephas*, (that is, *Peter*,) and *John*, all at Once, calls them *Pillars*, without any *Distinction*, Gal. ii. 9. And here, besides the *Placing St. James* in *Order Before St. Peter*, which does not look like *Giving Respect enough* to the *Supreme Head* of the *Church*, I cannot but *Observe* his *Peculiar Manner of Speaking*. Of *all Three* alike he saith, they *Seem'd* to be *Pillars*: And this *Expression of Seeming* to be *So*, though it might perhaps be *No Derogation*

E

from

from the Other Two; yet it was much Below what was Due to St. Peter, if he Really was such a Super-Eminent Rock as you maintain; and we may well think, that St. Paul would not have Used it at the Mention of *his* great Name, if he had been Such.

To this I will add what we find in the Revelation of St. John, xxi. 14, 17. where the Wall of that City (which Represents the Church,) had 12 Foundations, on which were the Names of the 12 Apostles; and this Wall being Measur'd, was an Hundred, Forty, and Four Cubits, which being exactly 12 times 12, Every Apostle will appear to have an Equal Part in the Foundation. This, I'll assure you, is no Fanciful Conjecture of my Own, but the Inference of divers very Learned Men.

ROM. Take now the Other following Text: I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and Whatsoever thou shalt Bind on Earth, shall be Bound in Heaven; and Whatsoever thou shalt Loose on Earth, shall be Loosed in Heaven, Ver. 19.

CON. Not to insist upon what Many of the Ancient Fathers say, viz. That this Promise was, at this time, made to All the rest of the Apostles, as well as St. Peter; I shall Observe, on your Side, That the Keys were indeed now Promis'd to None by Name, but St. Peter. And what will this make for his Supremacy? There are None among you so Weak, I presume, as to think that our Saviour intended to give any such Keys in a Literal Sence. You will All acknowledge sure, that they were only a Figure or Sign of that Power and Authority, with which he design'd to Invest the Apostle. And whatsoever this Power and Authority

is,

is, the *Same* we shall find elsewhere as Fully Promis'd to, and as Largely Confer'd upon, *All* the Rest of them likewise. Thus the Power of Binding and Loosing Promis'd to St. Peter in this Text, was also Promis'd to *Them* in the very Same Extent: Verily, I say unto you; *Whatsoever ye shall Bind on Earth, shall be Bound in Heaven; and Whatsoever ye shall Loose on Earth, shall be Loosed in Heaven.* Mat. xviii. 18. And when our Blessed Saviour came *Actually* to Bestow what here he Promis'd, and to Commit the Church to their Care and Government, he made no manner of Difference between *Them*, but said to *All* alike, *As my Father hath Sent Me, so Send I you.* Joh. xx. 21. And having said this, He Breathed on them, and then again thus spake to *Them All* alike, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever Sins ye Remit, they are Remitted unto them; and Whose soever Sins ye Retain, they are Retained.* Ver. 22, 23.

Now then, Since *Every One* of the Apostles had the *Same Mission*; since They had *All* the *Same Gift* of the Holy Ghost Imparted to Them; Since They had *All* the *Same Efficacy* of Power Promis'd to, and Bestow'd upon *Them*, that St. Peter Himself had, Tho' we should Grant that the *Keys*, (as to the *Word spoken*,) were Promis'd to *None but Him*, yet *This* is *Not Enough* to make Him their Supreme Head, One in Power and Jurisdiction Above Them All. For surely, the Power of the Keys being thus *Equally* Communicated to them *All*, They were *All* thereby made *Equal* in Power too: And the bare Want of the Promise of them in such Express Terms, can be no Tolerable Argument against *This*, Because Christ gave Them *All* as Much as the Keys themselves did Signifie.

R O M. Hear the next Proof: *And the Lord said, Simon. Simon; behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may Sift you as Wheat; but I have pray'd for thee, that thy Faith fail not. Luk. xxii. 31, 32.*

C O N. Truly this is Nothing to the Purpose. For our Blessed Saviour foreseeing what *Temptations* should fall upon St. Peter, did only Pray that he might *Continue Steadfast in the Faith*, And which way shall his *Perseverance* be made a Proof of his *Supremacy*? See theretore if you can find any better for it.

R O M. This is the last: *He said unto him the third time; Simon, Son of Jonas, Lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said to him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I Love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my Sheep. Joh. xxi. 17.*

C O N. From this, in Conjunction with the Context, you pretend to make a Double Argument for St. Peter's *Supremacy*. The first you bring from the *Question Demanded*, the Second from the *Thing Commanded* by our Saviour. The *Question* was *Thrice* put, *Simon, Lovest thou me?* And because 'tis *Once* found with this Addition [*more than these*] you do not stick to Affirm, that St. Peter Loved Christ *more than All the rest of the Apostles*; and that *Therefore More Power, Trust, and Authority* in the Church, was *Committed* to Him as a *Reward* of that his *Transcending Love*. But how Know you so *Assuredly*, that St. Peter did thus *Excel* them All in Love? God's Holy Word has no where Affirm'd it: Nor does St. Pe-

ter

ter Himself pretend to do so; but, as often as our Saviour asks him the Question, answers with the greatest Modesty, Lord, Thou Knowest that I Love thee, without any Comparison. And indeed, if it be Lawful to Argue from our Own Conjectures, (as you do) 'tis very Probable, That he Loved Most, who was in a most Peculiar Manner the Beloved Disciple. For our Saviour's Love is Ordinarily Proportion'd to All, according to that Measure of Love which he Receives from Them.

R O M. Well; tho' it be still Doubtful, whether St. Peter's Love to Christ was Greater than that of the other Apostles, and whether his Commission was Enlarg'd upon any such Account; yet the latter part of the Verse makes most plainly for Him. For here He is Commission'd to Feed Christ's Sheep, whereas None of the Rest are.

C O N. 'Tis not any New Commission which our Saviour gives to St. Peter in these Words, but only a Charge that he should be Mindful and Diligent to Act according to That which he had Receiv'd before. And no Wonder if this was press'd upon Him more than the Rest, since He had more Heinously Transgress'd, than All the Rest, in the Denial of his Master. Christ then, as by the Three-fold Question he seems to put him in mind of that Triple Denial, so now at last he Engages the Apostle (as it were) to Atone for the Great Scandal of that Repeated Sin, by giving Openly as many Repeated Assurances of his Love; and to shew the Reality of that Love, by his Care of the Flock. And how Poor a Proof is this, that the Feeding of the Sheep did belong to St. Peter above the Rest?

Besides; if you Consult the Scripture, you will find it Clear, that They were All *Equally* Enjoyn'd to *Take heed unto the Flock*, over which the Holy Ghost had made them *Over-seers*; that They were All *Equally* Empower'd to *Feed the Church of God*, which He *Purchas'd* with his *Blood*. For when our Blessed Saviour *Communicated* this Power to Them in full, Commanding them to *Teach all Nations and Baptize them*; to *Go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to Every Creature*; He did not then Fix upon either of Them the least Note of *Superiority*, or so much as *Distinction*. Their *Commissions* were All alike *Universal and Unlimited*; not Requiring any *Subjection*, not Expressing any *Subordination* to St. Peter. This you will find, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* and *Mar. xvi. 15.* And so, All the Texts that you have produc'd. will not amount to One Good Proof of St. Peter's *Supremacy*: And Consequently, 'tis without any *Scripture-Authority*, That you *Believe the Bishop of Rome, as his Successor, to be Vicar of Jesus Christ upon Earth, and Head of the Whole Catholick Church.*

ROM. If St. Peter Himself indeed had no such *Supremacy*, then neither can the Pope have it by *Succession* from Him. But that, I think, you have not yet *Sufficiently* Prov'd against St. Peter.

CON. I'll endeavour therefore to make it out, And so I say farther, That if St. Peter had been *Invested* with any such *Supremacy*, certainly the *Divine Historians* would have made some Mention of it. We find them Careful to *Record* many things of Less Moment and Concern: And most strange it is, that they should *All Conspire to Omit* this, and leave us *not One Testimony* of a Matter
of

of so Great Importance. *Many*, saith St. Luke, have taken in hand to set forth in Order a Declaration of those Things, which are most surely Believed among us: And he Himself having had Perfect Understanding of all the same things from the very First, undertakes to Write them in Order to Theophilus, that he might Know the Certainty of them. Luk. i. 1, 3, 4. And since both He, and All the Rest have been wholly Silent in this Particular; We must Necessarily Conclude, either that They were *All Unfaithful Witnesses and Evangelists*, (which No good Christian will think,) Or that *This can be No Article of the Christian Faith*.

Besides; These *Historians* are not only Silent as to any such Matter, but They Relate many things also directly Contrary thereunto. When there was a Strife among the *Apostles*, which of them should be the Greatest; They do not tell us, that our Blessed Saviour Decided the Controversie by Setting up St. Peter for the Man; but by Setting before them a Little Child to teach them Humility and Lowliness of Mind; and by Declaring, that if any of them should Desire to be First, the same should be Last and Servant of all. Mar. ix. 35, 36. St. Luke also shews, that when they fell into the same Dispute, Christ would have no such Kind of Monarchy Erected; and that (as his Kingdom was not of this World, so) None of them should be, like the Kings of the Gentiles, Exercising Lordship and Authority Over the Rest. Luk. xxii. 24, 25.

Again: Had it been True, that St. Peter was Constituted Vicar of Christ, and Supreme Head of the Catholick Church, Doubtless Some of the Apostles would have Used a Recourse to his Chair in Matters of Controversial Difficulty, which often happen'd among Them; Or St. Peter himself would

would have been so *Mindful* of the Welfare of the Church, as to have *Interpos'd* his *Authority* in such Cases, and to have *Exercis'd* his *Uncontroulable Power* in the *Composing* those *Differences*, and in *Keeping the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*.

But we do not find, throughout All God's Word, Either that they ran to St. Peter with any such *Appeals*, Or that *He himself* did Pretend a *Right to Over-rule* in any such Matters, or so much as to *Prescribe the Determination* of them. And indeed, had he *Claim'd* any such *Prerogative*, had he *Assum'd* any such Kind of *Power*; 'tis highly *Probable*, that the Rest of the Apostles would have thought it a Great *Encroachment*, and have *Disputed* the Case with him too. For when he seem'd to *Compel the Gentiles* (and that, as many of your *Own* say, by the *Authority* of his *Example* only,) to *Live after the manner of the Jews*, St. Paul Openly *Rebuk'd* him for it, and even *Withstood him to the Face*. Gal. ii. 11. And now, if he met with such Opposition, when He did but *Guide his Own Practice* according to that *Measure of Infallibility and Power* which Christ had given Him; how much Greater had he found, if he had gone so far in this *Compulsion*, as to *Command* others to do the Same? And do you think, that St. Paul would have been *Guilty of Resisting or With-standing the Sacred Person of St. Peter*, if he had not been very well *Assur'd*, that No such *Headship or Supremacy* did Really belong to Him?

R O M. I must Confess, I know not how to Answer these Arguments. But however, before I yield up the Point, I will hear what you can say to the Close of this Article, which runs thus: *This Church is therefore fitly stil'd Roman-Catholick,*
being

being an Universal Body United under One Visible Head.

CON. You can never *Believe* this to be *True*, unless you *Believe* a *Particular* to be an *Universal Church*; and that there are *No Sound Believers* in the *World*, but *Such* as are *United* in the *Profession* of that *Visible Head*, the *Bishop of Rome*.

ROM. Sure I am, here is Scripture for it, viz. *Eph. iv. 11, &c.*

CON. I see there is, and the Words are these: *He gave Some, Apostles; Some, Prophets; Some, Evangelists; Some, Pastors and Teachers; for the Perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, and for the Edifying of the Body of Christ; till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto a Perfect Man, unto the Measure of the Stature of the Fulness of Christ.*

Now St. Paul does here Enumerate the Chiefest of those *Officers*, and *Ministers*, which Christ did Constitute in his Church, for the *Government* and *Instruction* of it: those that He Appointed even for the *Perfecting* of it in *All things*: And sure, if amongst *These*, there had been any *One Visible Head*, that ought to be accounted *Supreme*, and under whom the *Universal Church* was then *United*, (and especially if the *Continuance* of such an *One* was to be *Believed* as an *Article of Faith* in *All future Ages*.) the Apostle would have set some *Peculiar Mark* upon Him; and instead of Concealing his Person, have given Him his *Due Character and Precedence*. But no such thing he did. And therefore, since your *Supreme Visible Head*

Head is said to be so by Succession to One of the Order of the Apostles, and since no one among These is here Noted for Such: Surely, if this Proof of your's alone may Decide the Matter, we must Conclude against the Truth of this great Article.

R O M. But still Reason, methinks, Teacheth us to Believe, That Christ would not leave the Whole Body of the Church without some such Visible Head for the better Government and Instruction of it. For, *What is a Body without a Head?*

C O N. This Body indeed is not without a Head: For Christ Himself is the Head of it. And since he has no where Reveal'd to Us in his Word, that he did Appoint any such Visible Head, or Universal Vicar, under him upon Earth: since also He is Able to Govern and Instruct his Whole Church, altogether as Well, without such an One, as with Him; our Reason certainly should not run beyond Revelation, but Teach us to Believe, that Such an One was never set up by Christ. And so let us proceed to the next Section.

S E C T.

S E C T. III.

*Of some Particular Controverted Points
of Faith.*

R O M. **W**HAT say you to the First Article of this Section, which sheweth, *That Christ gave his Apostles and their Successors, the Bishops and Priests of the Catholick Church, Authority to Absolve all true Penitents from their Sins.*

C O N. I find nothing here indeed, but what I may safely Subscribe to. And this must needs be a Matter of very great Comfort to *Every True Penitent*. But since your great Council of Trent * has expressly Declar'd, *That if the Priest hath not a Mind (or Intention) truly to Absolve the Penitent, neither must he think himself to be Truly Absolv'd*; What Solid Comfort can any Member of your Church receive from hence? The poor Penitent, alas! (tho' the most Humble and Sincere,) can never be Certain that he is *Really and Truly Absolv'd*, because he can never be Certain, that it is the *Mind (or Intention)* of the Priest *So to Absolve him*.

R O M. Have you any thing to Except against the Second Article?

C O N. Yes, surely: For here it is said, *Penitent Sinners Redeem'd by Christ, may, as Members*

* Sess. 14. Cap. 6.

of Christ, in some measure Satisfie by Prayer, Fasting, Alms-Deeds, and other Works of Piety, for the Temporal Pain which by Order of Divine Justice sometimes Remain Due, after the Guilt of Sin, and Pains Eternal are (*gratis*) Remitted.

Now the Satisfying Divine Justice, in any Measure, must Necessarily imply the Making some Real Compensation for the Demerit of Every Offence: And how can any one make Such Compensation for his Sins, in any Measure, by All his Good Works? Tho' he Perform them All after the very best Manner that he is Able, yet still he does no more than his Bounden Duty; and What can possibly Redound from hence to Compensate for All that the Divine Justice might inflict for his former Transgressions? Surely they who have most Good Works to shew, have, after all, Sin enough Remaining to make them Guilty in the Sight of God. For, *Who can say, I have made my Heart Clean, I am Pure from my Sin.* Prov. xx. 9. Does not the Wise Preacher tell us, *There is not One Just Man upon Earth, that doth Good, and sinneth not?* Ecclel. vii. 20. Does not St. James tell us, that *In many things we Offend All?* Ch. iii. 2. I cannot but Wonder therefore, that your Paper pretends to shew so many Texts for the Proof of Such a Doctrine.

ROM. The first is, *Act. xxvi. 20.* Where St. Paul shews, how, in Obedience to the Heavenly Vision, he Preached in several Places, That Men should Repent, and Turn to God, and do Works meet for Repentance.

CON. But St. Paul did not say, that by So Doing they should Satisfie for any Temporal Pain which by Order of Divine Justice might Remain Due

Due to them, after the Guilt of Sin and Pains Eternal were Remitted. And so this Proof comes not Near the Point.

R O M. The next is drawn from the Example of the *Ninevites*, who when *Jonas* had shewn the Destruction of their great City, immediately *Proclaim'd a Fast, and put on Sackcloth, from the Greatest of them even unto the Least.* *Jon. iii. 5, &c.*

C O N. But surely you will not say, that this People gave any such *Satisfaction* to God's Justice by all that they did. *When God saw their Works, that they Turned from their Evil Way*, then indeed God Repented of the Evil that he said he would do unto them, and he did it not, *Ver. 10.* But, What was their *Moving* God's Compassion to their Satisfying his Justice? What was the Merit of their Repentance to the Demerit of their Sins? Certainly their Humiliation could be no Compensation in Proportion Answerable to their Wickedness: And had God dealt with them According to their Iniquities, He had still Repaid their Evil with Evil.

R O M. Take the two next together: *I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with Weeping, because of thine Indignation and thy Wrath; For thou hast lifted me up, and cast me down.* *Psal. cii. 9, 10.* *I am gone like the Shadow, when it declineth: I am tossed up and down as the Locust: My knees are weak thro' Fasting, and my Flesh faileth of Fatness.* *Psal. cix. 23, 24.*

C O N. So far is the Royal Prophet here from Pretending to Satisfie God's Justice for any Temporal Pain which he endur'd, that he does most earnestly Implore the Divine Mercy for the Re-
F removal

removal of it, in both these Psalms. Hear his own words: *O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days. Help me, O Lord, my God; O save me according to thy Mercy.* Psal. cii. 24. and cix. 26. He depends not upon the Merit of all his Prayer and Fasting; but begs that the Divine Pity and Compassion may appear instead of his Justice.

R O M. What say you then to that of Daniel: *And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by Prayer and Supplications, with Fasting, and Sackcloth, and Ashes.* Dan. ix. 3.

C O N. Daniel here gives a particular Account how he Address'd himself unto God in the behalf of his Brethren the Jews, who were then in Captivity. And lo; Notwithstanding these his Prayers, and Supplications, with Fasting, Sackcloth, and Ashes; when he Consider'd the Order of Divine Justice, he Confess'd nothing Less to be Due than Confusion of Faces. Ver. 7, 8. So far was He from Trusting in any thing which he could Offer by way of Satisfaction in all this Performance, that the Only Ground of his Hope was This, *To the Lord our God belong Mercies and Forgivenesses, tho' we have Rebelled against him.* Ver. 9. These alone therefore he Solicits: And, as if he were Designedly Protesting against this very Doctrine, thus he Concludes his Prayer, *We do not present our Supplications before thee for our Righteousnesses, but for thy Great Mercies.* Ver. 18.

R O M. The next Proof is that of Joel, where God calls upon the People, saying, *Turn ye even unto me with all your heart, with Fasting, and with Weeping, and with Mourning.* Joh. ii. 12.

C O N.

C O N. God having in the former part of this Chapter threatned the Wicked Jews with very *Terrible Judgments*, does here call them to *Repentance*, as the *Only Means* to Avert his Wrath, and to Save themselves from Destruction. He tells them, that if they will *Hearken to his Voice* to do this, then he will be *Jealous for his Land*, and *Pity his People*: Then he will *Send them Corn, and Wine, and Oyl*, and they shall be *Satisfied with his Bounty*. Ver. 18, 19. But he does not tell them, that they shall Gain all this by the Merit of any *Satisfaction* which they might thus make to his Justice. No, no: He does not now shew himself in the least Appearance of this great *Attribute*; but seems rather on purpose to have laid it aside, lest Reflecting upon the *Terrible Order* of it, they should *Despair* of Escaping what was Threatned. And therefore he *Proclaims* himself to them by no Other Property, but that of being *Gracious and Merciful, Slow to Anger, and of great Kindness, and One that Repenteth him of the Evil*. Ver. 13. How little then is this Doctrine of your's Confirm'd by this Proof?

R O M. But I have two more yet, viz. *Rather give Alms of such things as you have, and behold all things are Clean unto you*. Luk. xi. 41. *Thy Prayers and thine Alms are come up for a Memorial before God*. Act. x. 4.

C O N. In the former of these our Blessed Saviour Opposeth *Alms* to *Outward Washings*, as appears by the Context: For the Pharisees thought none to be *Clean*, but those that joyn'd with them in the Ceremony of *Frequent Washing*. And therefore They *Marvelled at our Saviour*, because He did not Wash before Dinner. Ver. 38. Now

from this *Opinion* and *Practice*, our Saviour shews Them to be most grievous *Hypocrites*, Ver. 39. and then at last tells them, in this Verse, That if They would be accounted *Pure and Clean* indeed, They should rather Demonstrate themselves to be *So*, by making their *Alms as Frequent* as their *Washings*.

In the latter Text, an Angel appears to *Cornelius*, and tells Him the good Success of his Constant *Prayers and Alms*; They are *Come up* (saith he) for a *Memorial* before God. And so they were made an *Odour of a Sweet Smell*, A *Sacrifice acceptable and Well pleasing* unto Him.

But all this while, no such *Efficacy* is Ascrib'd, or Promis'd, to the *Good Works* either of the *Pharisees*, or of *Cornelius*, as that They were, or should be, reputed *Worthy* to *Satisfie* for any *Temporal Pain* which by *Order of Divine Justice* might be *Due* to Them. And so, after all these Texts heap'd up together, Your *Doctrine* stands *Condemn'd* by *Scripture* still.

R O M. But you should consider this in *Conjunction* with that which follows: *These Penitential Works* are, notwithstanding, *Satisfactory* no *Otherwise* than as *Joyn'd* and *Applied* to that *Satisfaction* which *Jesus* made upon the *Cross*, in *Virtue* of which alone, all our *Good Works* find a *Grateful Acceptance* in *God's Sight*.

C O N. This is added to *Smooth* it Over: But doubtless, 'tis more for the *Honour* of our great *Redeemer*, That we should *Acknowledge* the *Fulness* of His *Satisfaction*, without any *Meritorious Concurrence* of our *Own Works*. For when we pretend to *Joyn* any thing of our *Own* to what He hath *Done*, by way of *Satisfaction*, we do in *Effect* say,

say, that *He* hath not *Done Enough* to *Satisfie* for Us. For, how can *God's Justice* be *Fully Satisfied by Him*, when any *Satisfactory Performances* shall be *Requir'd* afresh from *Us*?

But tho' we dare not be so *Bold*, as to place our *Own Selves* in *Conjunction* with *Christ* towards the *Co-operating* in any *Kind of Satisfaction*; yet we most *Thankfully Believe*, That *through the Merits of Christ, Our Good Works* shall be found *Truly Acceptable in the Sight of God*. And this is all that you can possibly *Infer* from the *Text of St. Peter* (the *Only Proof* in your *Paper* for this part of the *Article*.) where it is said, *Ye are an Holy Priesthood, to Offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, Acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.* 1 Pet. ii. 5.

ROM. I desire your *Remark* upon the next *Article*.

CON. Here I have some *Cause to Suspect*, either that your *Author* does not well *Know* the *Practice* of your *Church*, or that he is willing to *Prevaricate* about it. For He affirms, that the *Guilt of Sin, or Pain Eternal Due to It, is never* (in your *Church*) *Remitted by Indulgences*; whereas several of your own very *Popes* have in their *Bulls* publish'd such *Indulgences*, as *Contain a most full Remission* even of the *Guilt of Sin*. This has been very *Evidently* made out, by the *Learned Answerer* to the *Papist Mis-represented*, &c. Chap. viii. *. And *Such Indulgences* we do but justly cry out against.

But as for those which are only (as your *Paper* saith,) a *Mitigation, and Relaxation, upon just*

* *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented.*

Causes, of Canonical Penances, enjoyn'd by the Pastors of the Church on Penitent Sinners, according to their several Degrees of Demerit, we shall not much Complain of Them.

Nor do we think, that Those *Abuses, or Mistakes*, which may sometimes be Committed amongst you, in point either of Granting or Gaining Indulgences, thro' the Remission or Ignorance of Particular Persons, can Rationally be Charged upon your [Whole] Church.

But now, when your very Church her self Openly Indulgeth Sinners so far, as to Pardon their Sins for a Sum of Money, Who but She can be Rationally Charg'd with Such Abuses? And that She doth so, the Tax of the Apostolick Chamber is it self a Pregnant Proof; in which there is a Price set upon the greatest Sins as a Purchase of, or a Fee for, their Forgiveness. And if you never heard of this Tax before, you may see very good Authorities for it in the Book and Chapter last mention'd.

ROM. The next Article is this: *Catholicks hold there is a Purgatory, that is to say, a Place or State, where Souls Departing this Life with Remission of their Sins as to the Eternal Guilt or Pain, are yet Obnoxious to some Temporal Punishment still remaining Due; or not Perfectly freed from the Blemish of some Venial Defects or Deordinations, (as Idle Words, &c. not Liable to Damnation,) are Purged before their Admittance into Heaven, where Nothing that is Defil'd can Enter. And for this, here are several Proofs out of both the Old, and New Testament.*

CON. First shew me those of the Old.

ROM.

R O M. Numb. xiv. 20, &c. *And the Lord said, I have Pardon'd according to thy Word. But because all those Men that have seen my Glory, and my Miracles which I did in Egypt, and in the Wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkned to my Voice: Surely They shall not see the Land, which I sware unto their Fathers; neither shall any of them that provo'd me, see it, but my Servant Caleb.* 2 Sam. xii. 13, &c. *And Nathan said to David, the Lord hath put away thy Sin, thou shalt not Die. Howbeit, because by this Deed thou hast given great Occasion to the Enemies of the Lord to Blaspheme, the Child that is born unto thee shall surely Die.* Prov. xxiv. 16. *A Just Man falleth seven times, and riseth up again; but the Wicked shall fall into Mischief.*

C O N. All these now will yield no more of an Argument for Purgatory; than In the Beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth, and so many Verses following. For here is not the least Mention (nor indeed Supposal) of any Temporal Punishment, or of any Purgation at all in the other World. Let me see therefore if you can produce any Better Proofs from the New Testament.

R O M. The first is, *Mat. xii. 36. But I say unto you, that every Idle Word that Men shall speak, they shall give an Account thereof in the Day of Judgment.*

C O N. How! The Article asserts, that Idle Words are only Venial Defects, and not Liable to Damnation; but this Text is a most Direct Confutation of it. For if an Account must be given of Them in the Day of Judgment, such Idle Words

Words (by which are meant Lying Words) cannot be *Venial Defects*, but are certainly *Liable to Damnation*. And of *Such Words* our Saviour speaking in the very next Verse, saith, *By thy Words thou shalt be Condemned*. And will you take this for a Proof?

ROM. 'Tis only the Printer's Mistake, I suppose.

CON. Ay; 'tis well if he can make it *Venial*, and bring it within the *Compass* of that &c. in the *Parenthesis*.

ROM. But he is *Right* still, I believe, as to the Chapter; and it should rather have been *Ver. 32*, where we find these Words: *Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall never be Forgiven him, Neither in this World, neither in the World to Come*. And does it not follow from hence, that there is a *Place* in the *Other World*, where They who Die with Remission of their Sins *as to the Eternal Guilt or Pain Only*, must undergo some *Temporal Punishment that Remains Due to Them*?

CON. The *Inference* indeed is so strange, that I cannot Apprehend it. For the Words seem to be spoken *only* of Those *Departing Souls*, whose Sins shall *Never* be Remitted, and whose *Punishment* shall be *Eternal*.

ROM. You are very Dull of Apprehension in this Matter. Why; the Text, you see, says, that *So Great* a Sin shall not be *Forgiven*, either in *This World*, or in the *World to Come*; and this plainly supposes, that some Sins of a *Smaller Kind* which are not *Wholly Forgiven in This World*, may be *Forgiven in That to Come*.

CON.

CON. By the *World to Come*, divers Learned Interpreters do Understand the *Age of the Messiah*, or the *Time of his Coming into the World*. And Their Interpretation seems very well to Answer the Mind of our Saviour in this place. For as the Jews call'd the *Time of the Messiah's Advent the World to Come*, and thought that after His *Advent*, no Sins whatsoever would be *too Great to be Forgiven*: So our Blessed Saviour, *Confuting* this Dangerous Opinion, and shewing the *Sin against the Holy Ghost* to be *Irremissible*, Conformeth himself to their own way of Speaking; and tells them that it shall *not be Forgiven, Neither in This World* by any *Sacrifices* that they could Offer under their *Old Legal Dispensation*; Nor in the *World to Come*, by any other *Messiah* that they could afterwards expect, if they became *Guilty* of it by *Maliciously* Rejecting Him, whom the Spirit of God did most Convincingly Demonstrate to be the *True One* by many Signs and Miracles. And sure you cannot Ground your *Purgatory* upon the Words thus Interpreted.

ROM. Indeed we do not. But then there is another Interpretation, as Natural perhaps, and as much *Approv'd* of by Learned Men, viz. that by the *World to Come*, is meant the *State after Death*. And so, I think, Our Doctrine of *Purgatory* may very well be made out by it too.

CON. I shall freely allow this Interpretation likewise. But then let me ask; Do you understand hereby, That *State* of Men only, which is *between Death and the Resurrection*? Or that *State* in which They shall be found *At, or After* the Resurrection? If you mean the *latter*, then I grant you, that there is a *Forgiveness in the World*

World to Come, by way of Declaration. For All those who Depart this Life *with Remission of their Sins*, shall Then hear their Pardon Openly Pronounc'd by the *Mouth* of the great Judge, and Receive the *Full Benefit* of it. Their *Bodies* shall Then be Releas'd from their long Imprisonment in the *Grave* of Corruption; and They shall Then be *Translated into the Glorious Liberty of the Sons of God*. But what follows from hence? Certainly it cannot be said of *Such*, that They have any *Temporal Pains* of *Purgatory* to Undergo *At*, or *After*, this Joyful Resurrection.

R O M. Doubtless those *Blessed Ones* are Then beyond all *Manner* of *Sufferings*: They are Then beyond Every thing that is *Temporal*, and have Nothing before them but *Eternity*.

C O N. Well then: If hereby you mean that *State of Men*, which is *between* Death and the Resurrection, I deny that any shall be *Forgiven in the World to Come*. For saith *Solomon*, *If the Tree fall toward the South, or toward the North, in the place where the Tree falleth, there it shall be*. Ecclef. xi. 3. From whence I infer, that, If a Man be *Cut off from the Land of the Living* BEFORE he has made his *Peace* with God, so that he cannot then *Enter into Eternal Rest*, his Condition shall not be AFTERWARDS Chang'd for the Better: But as He goes down to the *Grave without the Full Pardon of All his Sins*, so there he shall *Remain without any more Forgiveness*; and after *Death* find nothing but *Judgment*, like that *Tree* which is *hewn down to be Cast into the Fire*.

But if this be not Plain enough, pray, mind well what *St. Paul* says: *We must All appear before*

fore the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that Every One may receive the things done in his Body, according to that he hath done, whether it be Good or Bad. 2 Cor. v. 10. Here the Apostle shews, that we shall be Universally Summon'd at the Last Day to Judgment, and How the great Judge of all the World will then Proceed in his Sentence upon Us; He will Judge Every Man According to those Deeds which he hath Done *In the Body*: And by Consequence, As he hath fitted himself for Judgment when he leaves the Body, so accordingly he shall Receive the Sentence in that Day. If therefore he hath not Thoroughly Work'd out his Salvation whilst he was IN THE BODY, he can Never do it after he is OUT OF THE BODY, because That is the time when No Man can Work. Joh. ix. 4. And if his Sins are too Many to be FULLY REMITTED in *This World*, neither shall they be FORGIVEN in the *World to Come*.

R C M. Speak now to the next Proof: *Whosoever is Angry with his Brother without a Cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his Brother, Racha, shall be in danger of the Council; but whosoever shall say, Thou Fool, shall be in danger of Hell-fire.* Mat. v. 22. Here by Hell-fire are meant Pains Eternal; but by the Judgment and the Council, are meant only Temporal Pains, which the Offenders must undergo either in *this World*, or in the *Next*: And these latter are no other than the Pains of Purgatory.

C O N. These Words are our Saviour's *Exposition* upon the *Sixth Commandment*: And therefore, that we may the better understand him, let us look up to the foregoing Verse, where we find that *Commandment*, together with the *Occasion*
of

of this his *Comment* upon it. There then he speaks to the Jews after this manner: *Ye have heard that it was said by them Old time, Thou shalt not Kill; and Whosoever shall Kill, shall be in danger of the Judgment.* That is, "Your Ancient Doctors have taught you, that This is the Law of your God; and that They who Transgress it, shall be *Obnoxious* to *Punishment*, not only here in the *Courts* of Men, but also hereafter in the *Courts* of the most High, where they shall be *Condemn'd* to *Everlasting Torments*. And so far indeed they *Rightly* taught you, when they said, *He that Killeth shall be in danger of the Judgment.* But yet they did not tell you *All* that this Law doth *Forbid*, nor shew you *All* your *Danger*: For I say unto you, (or I assure you,) that it doth *Forbid* not only *Actual Murder*, but also the being *Immoderately*, or *Causelessly*, *Angry* with a Brother; the *Deriding*, or *Scoffing* at him, which the Word, *Racha*, signifies; and the *Railing* against him, or *Reviling* him with *Bitterness*, which is meant by saying, *Thou Fool*. And that, for the future, you may avoid *These* also, as *Sinful Violations* of the same *Commandment*, I do farther *Assure* you, that God will *Punish Them* as *Such* in the *Other World*, even with an *Eternal Punishment* too. However, because *These* are *Some* of a *Greater*, *Some* of a *Lesser Guilt*, therefore They shall not be *Punish'd All Alike* indeed; but *Some* with *More*, *Some* with *Fewer Stripes*, according to the *Quality* of the *Offence*. And this our Saviour shews by *Alluding* to the several *Degrees of Punishment*, which the Jews were wont to inflict upon *Offenders*, according to their *Deserts*. "They (saith he) that are found in the *Least* of these *Sins*, shall be *Obnoxious* to the *Least*

“ *Least Punishment*, like those among you,
 “ which are in *Danger of the Judgment Only*:
 “ They that are Guilty in the *Next Degree*, shall
 “ be yet *more Severely* dealt with, like those that
 “ are in *Danger of the Council*: But they, whose
 “ Transgressions are of the *Highest Rank*, shall be
 “ Condemn’d to *most Exquisite* Torments, like
 “ those that are Tormented in the *Burnings of*
 “ *Gehennah*, the Greatest of your Punishments;
 which the Words translated [*Hell-Fire*] do most
 Truly and Properly signifie. This I take to be
 the Plain Meaning of our Saviour’s Words.

ROM. A fair Interpretation indeed. But,
 Why do you make the *Judgment* and the *Council*
 thus to signifie *Pains Eternal*?

CON. Because our Saviour makes the *Same*
 Kind of Punishment *Due* to the *Least* Transgres-
 sion of this Law, which the Jewish Doctors As-
 sign’d to the *Greatest*. For, as They said, *He that*
Killeth shall be in Danger of the Judgment; so said
 He likewise concerning the Man that should but
 be *Angry with his Brother without a Cause*: There
 is not the *Least Tittle* to shew a *Difference* between
 the *Nature* of the Punishment of Each.

That those Jewish Doctors did by the *Judg-*
ment Understand no Less than *Pains Eternal*, and
 teach the People also that These were *Due* to
 Every One that *Killed*, seems to me very Clear:
 Because otherwise They had Understood it *Wrong*,
 and Taught the People *Wrong*; and then our Sa-
 viour would most Certainly have taken some Par-
 ticular Notice of it in this his *New Exposition*.
 For it was his Design’d Business at this time, to
 Discover their False and Corrupt Glosses upon
 the Law; and to shew the People; that there

were *Such* Transgressions of it, and *Such* Punishments Due to them, as they had *never before Learnt* from their Teachers.

But now our Saviour Adding nothing to what They had said of the Punishment of *Actual Murder*, which was the *Greatest Violation* of this Law, we may safely Conclude, that so far They did Expound it aright, and that by the *Judgment* They meant even *Hell* it self. And so, the Punishment of *Causeless or Immoderate Anger*, in our Saviour's Words, being the *very Same*, without the Alteration of *One Tittle*, it cannot be *Less* than *Pains Eternal*.

And if the *Judgment* must needs Signifie such an *Eternal Punishment*, then the *Council* cannot possibly Signifie any thing *Less*, because our Saviour makes *This* the Punishment of *Greater Sins*. And so neither the *One*, nor the *Other* of *These* can yield you the *Least Grounds* for your *Temporal Pains of Purgatory*.

ROM. But why then should our Saviour use *Three Several Words* to Express *One and the Same* very Punishment?

CON. I told you before, that he spake this by way of *Allusion* to those *Three Degrees* of Punishment which were so well known among the Jews; and that by this *Rhetorical Gradation* his whole Design was to *Convince* them, that there were *Several Degrees* of *Murder* which they had not yet Understood; and which, without Repentance, would render them *Obnoxious* to the Vengeance of God, as well as that of *Killing*; and be Punish'd with an *Eternal* also, tho' not with an *Equal* Punishment. Let me see therefore if you have any better Proofs for this *Purgatory*.

ROM.

R O M. You may see another in the Same very Chapter: *Verily, I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means Come out thence [Till] thou hast Paid the Uttermost farthing.* Mat. 5. 26. Now in the foregoing Verse there is a *Prison* mention'd, into which the Offender is in Danger of being *Cast* by the Judge; and when he is in *It*, Our Saviour says, he cannot *Come out thence [Till]* he hath made the *Uttermost Satisfaction*. By this *Prison* then I do understand the *Place* or *State* of Some Men in the *Other World*. But to *Heaven* Such a Name can never Agree; and therefore it must Signifie either *Hell* or *Purgatory*. But *Hell* it cannot be, because *None* can possibly be *Redeem'd* from thence: And Consequently, it is No Other *Place* but *Purgatory*.

C O N. I shall allow, that the *Prison* may Signifie the *Place* or *State* of Some Men in the *Other World*: But then, the following Words, upon which you argue, do not in the least suppose, that They who are once in *It*, can never be Recover'd Out of *It* by any *Payment* or *Satisfaction*. For they shall by no means *Come out thence [Till]* they have Paid the *Uttermost Farthing*, does imply rather, that They shall *Never Come out at all*; that They shall *Never Pay* the Debt after they are *There*; and Consequently, that the *Prison* cannot be *Purgatory*, but *Hell* it self.

R O M. This indeed is a very *Strange* Interpretation of it.

C O N. 'Tis no less *Strange*, that you do not so Interpret it likewise: For so you All Interpret the very *Same* Word in another *Place*. And indeed, should you Interpret *That*, as you

do *This*, you would be *Guilty* of a *Sin too Great* (in the Opinion of Many of your own Church) to be ever Satisfied for in your Imaginary Purgatory: I mean, a Kind of *Blasphemy* against the *Blessed Virgin Mary* her self. The Place is this: *Joseph Knew Her not [Till] she had brought forth Her First-born Son.* Mat. i. 25. Where the Word [Till] does as strongly Suppose that he *Knew Her* after, as it does that any *Debtor can Pay the Uttermost Farthing*, and be *Releas'd* from this *Prison* After he is once *Cast* into it. And by the same Reason that you Conclude, He *Never Knew Her*, I do also, that *This Debtor shall Never Come out thence.*

ROM. The next Proof is: *If any Man's Work shall be Burnt, he shall suffer Loss; but he himself shall be Saved, yet so as by Fire.* 1 Cor. iii. 15.

CON. The Apostle, in the Context, speaking of Jesus Christ as the Only *Foundation* of all True Christians, and supposing that upon this *Foundation* Men may *Build* either *Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones*, (by which he means *Good Doctrines* or *Practices*,) or *Wood, Hay, and Stubble*, (by which he means those that are *Bad*,) tells us, that *Every Man's Work* must be made *Manifest*; that there shall be a *Day to Declare* it; that it shall be *Reveal'd by Fire*; and that the *Fire shall try Every Man's Work* of what Sort it is. Ver. 12, 13. Now, saith he, *If any ones Work, or Building*, (that is, *Doctrines* or *Practices*) be like *Wood, Hay, or Stubble*. then at the *Approach* of this *Fire*, his *Work shall be Burnt, He shall suffer Loss; and if he himself be Saved, it is So as by Fire.*

And now I ask, Whether the Apostle's Discourse must be Understood in a *Literal*, or in a *Figurative*

Figurative Sence? If in a *Literal*, then it affords me Two Good Arguments against Purgatory. First, It plainly *Distinguisheth* the *Man* from his *Work*; and sheweth that the *Work* only is Burnt, not the *Person*, whereas for the *Person* alone your *Purgatory-Fire* is Prepar'd. Secondly, It sheweth that *EVERY Man's Work must be Tryed* by this *Fire*; and therefore it cannot be that of *Purgatory*, because ye your Selves Confess, that there are *Many Souls* which never come into that Place.

But if the Discourse be taken in a *Figurative* Sence, then it can never yield any Proof of a *Real Fire*, such as you affirm that of *Purgatory* to be. Then the Apostle did speak only by way of *Similitude*, to shew the *Manner* of such a Man's Escape; *he shall be sav'd*, but how? *So as by Fire*. And this is a *Proverbial* Kind of Speech, here and elsewhere Expressing the *Greatness* of any Danger, and the *Difficulty* of Avoiding it. Thus, *Amos iv. 11. Ye were as a Fire-brand pluckt out of the Burning*. So again, *Jude xxiii. Others save with Fear, pulling them out of the Fire*. And so your Doctrine of *Purgatory* stands yet without a Proof.

ROM. But I have one Proof behind still, which is this: *There shall in no wise enter into it (viz. Heaven) any thing that Defileth, neither whatsoever worketh Abomination, or maketh a Lye*. Rev. xxi. 27. Now some such Pravity and Corruption there is in most of Us, and so there must be such a *Place of Purgation* to fit us for Heaven.

CON. True indeed, there must be a *Purgation*, or *Cleansing*, before *Any* can Enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: But as this Text does not prove that it may be Done *After* Death; so I can shew

from divers Texts, that it is *Sufficiently*, and *Effectually*, done in *this Life*. *St. Paul* having drawn up a large Catalogue of those most Grievous Offenders that *shall not Inherit the Kingdom of God*, presents it to the *Corinthians*, telling *Some* of them, that *They* had been *Such*. *1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, 11.* But then immediately he addeth, *Ye are Washed, ye are Sanctified, ye are Justified in the Name of our Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* And surely, *EVERY Soul* that *Departs this Life* so *Wash'd*, so *Cleans'd*, and so *Justified*, can have no *Need* of any farther *Purgation* before its *Admittance* into *Heaven*: And *EVERY Soul* that is not so fitted for it by that *Holy Name* and *Spirit*, before it goes hence, can *Never After* be better *Qualified* to *Enter* into that *Blessed Place*.

Again, the same *Apostle* tells us, that *Christ* gave himself for the *Church*, that *He* might *Sanctifie* and *Cleanse* it with the *Washing of Water*, by the *Word*; that he might present it to *Himself* a *Glorious Church*, not having *Spot* or *Wrinkle*, or any such thing; but that it should be *Holy*, and without *Blemish*. *Eph. v. 26, 27.* And if your *Church* be the *True Church* of *Christ*, how comes it to pass, that so *Many* of her *Truest Members* should not be *Perfectly Freed* now by *Christ* from all *Spots* and *Blemishes*, but must undergo another *Purgation* in the *next World* before they can be *Admitted* into his *Presence*? The *Text* plainly shews, that the *True Members* of *Christ's Holy Church* are *Sufficiently Purg'd* even in *this Life*, because this *Purgation* is *Effected* by the *Washing of Water*, and by the *Word*. But what can be more *Contrary* to that *Cleansing Water*, than your *Purgatory Flames*? What more *Opposite* to that *Powerful Word* of *Sanctification*, than this your *Empty Fancy*?

But

But Lastly; St. John tells us, in short, that the *Blood of Jesus Christ Cleanseth us from All Sin.* 1 Joh. i. 7. that is, *From All Sin* which shall ever be *Purg'd*, or done away, by that *Most Precious Blood.* And if from *That Sin* which Deserves an *Eternal Punishment*, (as you grant to *All*, whose Sins are *Remitted* by it,) then much more surely from *That* which, as you Conceive, Deserves but *Temporal.* For 'tis very Strange indeed, that the *Smallest Sins* should still Retain so much *Guilt and Malignity*, as to hinder the *Departing Soul's Immediate Entrance into Happiness*, when the *Greatest* do not. It ever any one, that *Departed* this Life with *Remission* of his Sins as to the *Eternal Guilt or Pain*, was yet not *Perfectly Freed* from *All Pollution*, or *Deserv'd* to have his *Admittance* into *Everlasting Joys* *Deferr'd* till he had first undergone such a *State of Purgation*, certainly the *Thief* upon the *Cross* was the *Man*: For, a most *Vile, Infamous Malefactor* He was: He neither *Believ'd* in *Christ*, nor *Repented* of his Sins, until the very *Last Moment* of his Life: And yet to *Him* our Saviour said, *To day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.* Luk. xxiii. 43.

R O M. Hitherto you have spoken chiefly to the Point of a *Future Purgation*: Pray, how will you Convince me, that there are *no such Tormenting Pains* to be Endur'd in that *State*?

C O N. I will prove to you in General, that *None* of those for whom *Heaven* is Prepar'd, shall be *Condemn'd* to any such *Place or State* of *Future Torments.* And first we have our Saviour's Testimony, *Verily, verily, I say unto you; He that Heareth my Word, and Believeth in Him that sent me, hath Everlasting Life, and shall not Come into* *Condemnation.*

Condemnation. Joh. v. 24. Into this Life he Enters as soon as his Soul Departs from the Body, if we will Believe St. Paul: We know (saith he) that if our Earthly House of this Tabernacle were Dissolv'd, we have a Building of God, an House not made with hands, Eternal in the Heavens. 2 Cor. v. 1. And this is Confirm'd by St. John, who tells Us, the Dead are from Henceforth Blessed, which Die in the Lord; and that They Rest from their Labours. Rev. xiv. 13. All these Texts are so very Full and Plain, that there needs no Comment upon them.

ROM. The next Article runs thus: Catholicks also hold, That such Souls so detain'd in Purgatory, being the Living Members of Jesus Christ, are Reliev'd, by the Prayers and Suffrages of their Fellow-Members here on Earth.

CON. This Article wholly depends upon the Truth of the former; and therefore That being Over-thrown, This must of Necessity fall to the Ground. However, I am Contented to Spend a little time in Examining the Texts which are brought to Prove it.

ROM. This is the first: Why are ye then Baptized for the Dead? 1 Cor. xv. 29.

CON. There are Several Interpretations of this Text: But designing Brevity, I shall speak to none but That, on which you Build the present Doctrine. And that supposeth a Certain Custom, among some of the Corinthians in St. Paul's time, to Baptize the Living for such Believers as Died without Baptism. And if I favour this Interpretation so far as to Suppose the Same, you must

must give me leave to *Ask* you One or Two Short *Questions*. Was this *Suppos'd Custom* Good and Profitable to the Dead? Or Was it Vain and Fruitless? If the Former, then Why doth not your Church as well Baptize, as Pray, for the Dead? If the Latter, then tho' I should allow you, That Baptizing doth Infer (what it doth not Signifie,) Praying for the Dead, yet what Argument will you draw from hence, that you ought not to be *Asham'd* of? And so let us go on to the next Proof.

ROM. *Who now Rejoyce in my Sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the Afflictions of Christ in my Flesh, for his Body's sake, which is the Church.* Col. i. 24.

CON. Here is Nothing said, either of Prayers and Suffrages, or of the Dead; and so I may fairly Dismiss it without Answer, as being Nothing to the Purpose.

ROM. The next is, 2 Macc. xii. 42, &c. And here is not only an Instance of Praying for the Dead, but a Commendation of it too.

CON. This is taken out of the *Apocrypha*, which was never Esteem'd a Part of God's Sacred Word by the Soundest Members of the Catholick Church. And for this Cause we ought not to Depend upon the Authority of These Writings, as if they could give any Divine Sentence in the Deciding of Religious Controversies.

ROM. Yet the Whole *Apocrypha* is bound up with Many of your Bibles; and a Great Part of it is Read in your Own very Churches too.

CON.

CON. All this is Granted. For we suffer it to go along with our Bibles, to shew, that we Honour it, *next to God's Word*, for its *Antiquity*, and for those Good Instructions that are Contain'd in it. And because the *Reading* some Part of it in the Church, has been a *Custom of long Continuance*, therefore our Good Mother doth not wholly lay it Aside by way of Dissent from Others; but in a *Friendly Conformity* to Them, chooseth from it some certain Lessons, which may be *Profitable* to her Children. But still She *Declares* withal, that She does not Believe Them to be of the *Same Divine Origine* with Those Scriptures that are *Universally Receiv'd as Canonical*.

ROM. But sure Our Church is in the Right, which has *Declar'd* them to be *Equally Canonical*.

CON. If you would read Bishop Cosin's *History of the Canon of Holy Scripture*, you would be of another Mind; and to Him I refer you for *Conviction*, returning to your Proof.

You tell me then, that here is not only an *Instance* of Praying for the *Dead*, but a *Commendation* of it too. And what of all this? May we therefore *Imitate Every Kind of Action* that is *Commended* in this Book? Then we may *Dispatch* our Selves, by *Falling upon the Point* of our own *Swords*, by *Casting our selves down from a Precipice*, or by *Plucking out our Own very Bowels*, whensoever we are *Weary* of this World, and *Resolv'd* to Die. For so *Self-Murder* is, with all these *Circumstances*, *Commended and Extoll'd* in the very same Book. C. 14. 41, &c.

ROM.

R O M. There remains this One Proof more: *If any Man see his Brother Sin a Sin, which is not unto Death, he shall ask, and He (viz. God) shall give him Life for them that Sin not unto Death.* 1 Joh. v. 16.

C O N. But this Text doth not shew, that any among the *Dead* are in the least *Reliev'd* by the *Prayers and Suffrages of the Living*. For the Person, for whom St. John allows, or Commands us to *Pray*, is *Alive*, and not naturally *Dead*. In the *Original* we have a Participle of the *Present* Tense, which signifies one *Sinning*, that is, still *Living* in the *Act* or *Habit* of Sin: And he is said also to be *Seen* in the Commission of it. But neither of these can be *True* of any Man, whom you think to be *Reliev'd* by your *Prayers*, after he is *Dead*. For he *Ceaseth* doubtless to Sin *Then*: *Then* also he is gone from hence, and *no more Seen*. And so you see, how little these Proofs do Confirm your Doctrine of *Praying for the Dead*.

R O M. Give me now your *Opinion* of the Sixth Article.

C O N. I cannot be fully *Reconciled* to this Sentence: *The Good Works of a Just Man, proceeding from Grace and Charity, are Acceptable to God, so far forth, as to be thro' His Goodness and Sacred Promise, Truly Meritorious of Eternal Life*. Now these *Good Works*, I grant, are very *ACCEPTABLE* to God; but not so *Truly MERITORIOUS* in his Sight. They shall indeed be *Rewarded* with *Eternal Life*; but They can never *DESERVE* this *Reward* at God's Hand. And surely, we ought rather most *Thankfully* to *Adore* that *Goodness* which has *Promis'd*, that They shall be *So far Accepted*

cepted, than make any *Claim* to the *Reward* by Their *Merits*.

ROM. Well: But if God has *Promis'd* that They shall be so *Truly Meritorious*, 'tis *Base Ingratitude*, *Not to Acknowledge* it.

CON. 'Tis most Undoubtedly So. But then, where shall we find this *Sacred Promise* of God? Certainly, if it be any where, we shall now meet with it in some of your *Proofs*. And therefore let us *Search* your *Paper* for it.

ROM. One is brought from our Saviour's own Mouth, who pronounceth Them *Blessed* that are *Revil'd and Persecuted for his Sake*, and saith, *Great is your Reward in Heaven*. Mat. v. 12.

CON. But he doth not say, that this *Great Reward* is *Due* to the *Merit* of their *Sufferings*. And if *St. Paul* may be *Believ'd*, *No Sufferings here on Earth can Deserve* to be so *Rewarded* in *Heaven*. For he affirmeth, that the *Sufferings of this Present time are not Worthy to be Compar'd with the Glory that shall be Reveal'd in Us*. Rom. viii. 18.

ROM. Another *Proof* is, *Mat. x. 42.* where we find this *Promise* from our Saviour, *Whosoever shall give to Drink to One of these little ones a Cup of Cold Water Only, in the Name of a Disciple; Verily, I say unto you, He shall in no wise lose his Reward*.

CON. If the *Reward* here be That of *Eternal Life*, then according to your *Doctrine*, Such a *Cup of Cold Water Only* is indeed *Truly Meritorious*
of

of it. But certainly, Nothing like this can be inferr'd from the Sacred Promise of Christ.

ROM. Take the First in now with the Fourth: *Christ shall Reward every Man according to his Works.* Mar. xvi. 27. *We must All appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that Every One may Receive the things done in his Body, according to that he hath done, whether it be Good, or Bad.* 12 Cor. v. 10.

CON. These Texts do shew, that God will give to All, both Good and Bad, according to their Works; but they do not in the least intimate, that He will give to both Alike, according to the Merit of their Works. No, no: He will give to the Wicked no more than They Really Deserve: But He will Reward the Righteous abundantly beyond Their Deserts. And unless you can prove, That the Merit of their Good Works is Equal to the Reward which They Receive from God, you do Nothing to the Purpose.

ROM. Pray, mind well my last Proof then: Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge shall give me at that Day; and not to me Only, but to All them also that love his appearing. 2 Tim. iv. 8.

CON. And what does this make for the Merit of Good Works? St. Paul himself surely did not expect this Crown as a Reward Due, in Justice, to the Worthiness of his Labours; but as Promis'd, by the Meer Grace and Favour of God, to Him, and all those that should Finish their Course as He did.

ROM. But why do you say so? Has he not here a *Particular Eye* Upon the *Justice* of God? And does he not call Him *Righteous in Giving* this Reward?

CON. All this is True. But then God may be call'd *Just and Righteous* upon this account only, That He is *Faithful* to his Promises. So we read, *1 Joh. i. 9. If we Confess our Sins, God is Faithful and Just to Forgive us our Sins.* Now you will hardly say, I believe, that a *Bare Confession* of Sins to God, is *Truly Meritorious* of their *Forgiveness*: And yet the *Forgiveness* of them, upon this very *Act*, is Grounded upon God's *Justice*, as much as the *Giving* of that *Crown* for the Performance of any Works whatsoever.

That God's *Justice and Righteousness* is Concern'd to Give *Eternal Life* as the Reward of Good Works, I grant you, because He has Promis'd, that He will do it: But that any Such Works are *Truly Meritorious* of this Reward, I do Utterly Deny, being well Assur'd, that this Doctrine has No Foundation in Scripture. Nay, This is directly Contrary to the Scripture. For saith St. Paul, *By Grace ye are Saved, thro' Faith; and that not of your Selves, it is the Gift of God: Not of Works, lest any Man should Boast.* Eph. ii. 8, 9. And again; *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he Saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration, and Renewing of the Holy Ghost; that being Justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs according to the Hope of Eternal Life.* Tit. iii. 5, 7. And now let us go on to the next Article.

ROM. It is an Article of the Catholick Faith, That in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there

there is truly and really Contain'd, the Body of Christ which was Deliver'd for us, and his Blood which was shed for the Remission of Sins; the Substance of Bread and Wine being by the Powerful Words of Christ Chang'd into the Substance of his Blessed Body and Blood, the Species or Accidents of Bread and Wine still Remaining.

CON. That in this most Holy Sacrament, there is Truly and Really Contain'd the Body and Blood of Christ, is the Faith also of most Protestant Churches; and particularly, of the most Orthodox Church of England. For in her Catechism she tells us, that The Body and Blood of Christ are Verily and Indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper. And in her 28th Article she saith, To such as Rightly, Worthily, and with Faith receive the same, the Bread which we break, is the partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. But that the Substance of Bread and Wine are Changed into the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, This, (she saith, in the same Article,) Cannot be Prov'd by Holy Writ, but is Repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, &c.

ROM. She says all this indeed; but I find many Texts of Scripture in my Paper, to prove this Change against Her. And first, here is the plain Testimony of Three Evangelists, (viz. Mat. xxvi. 26. Mar. xiv. 22. Luk. xxii. 19.) who All agree in this Relation of it: As they were Eating, Jesus took Bread, and Blessed it, and Brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, Eat, This is my Body.

CON. The Relation, doubtless, is True: And all the Difference between You and Us, is only about the Sense of His Last Words, *This is My Body*. You will have them to be Understood Literally, and We believe them to be Figuratively Spoken. But before we proceed, let us Enquire, to What the Particle [This] refers. Does it Point at the Bread, think you, or Not?

ROM. Yes, surely: For the Whole Discourse was about Bread alone, till Christ pronounc'd these Words, *This is My Body*. And indeed, if the Particle [This] doth not Demonstrate or Speak of that Bread, I cannot Conceive, How it should Shew the Change of the Same Bread into the Body of Christ.

CON. Very good: And if by [This] the Bread is pointed at, then, How can the Saying, [This Bread is My Body,] be True, unless it be so by a Figurative Construction? Certainly, the Same very Thing cannot be both Real Bread, and the Real Body of Christ too.

ROM. No, no: These Powerful Words being once Utter'd by Christ, it Ceas'd immediately to be Bread, and was at the Same very Instant Chang'd into the Substance of his Body.

CON. And why then was there not the Same Change in the Other Part of the Sacrament? Christ did Institute This likewise for the Same End and Use: And speaking of the Cup, he did as Positively say, *This is my Blood*. Mat xxvi. 28. Mar. xiv. 24. So that there were the Same Powerful Words to make it good here too. But yet, you will not Affirm, that the Substance of the Cup was

was Chang'd into the Real Blood of Christ: And therefore, why should the Bread be any more Chang'd into his Real Body?

R O M. I must Confess, I know not how to Answer this. I believe Christ spake of the Cup by way of *Figure*; and I might be Inclind to think, that He spake *after the Same manner* of the Other likewise, if you could shew me some plain Instances in *Scripture*, where the Sign is said to Be that which it is Only Design'd to Signifie and Represent.

C O N. I can shew you Several, especially in things Relating to a Sacrament. So *Circumcision* is call'd *The Covenant*, Gen. xvii. 13. and yet it was Only a Sign or Token of that Covenant. So the *Paschal Lamb*. (to which This our Sacrament answers) is said to Be the Lord's *Passover*, Exod. xii. 11. and yet it was *No more* than a *Memorial* of it. So St. Paul tells us, that the Fathers of the Jewish Race did all *Drink of the same Spiritual Drink*; for *They Drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them: And that Rock* (he saith) *Was Christ*. 1 Cor. x. 4. Yet this *Rock* was Only a *Type* of Christ; nor could the Saying be True, but in a *Figurative* Sense. And so we have *Precedents Sufficient* to Warrant such our Interpretation of the Words, *This is My Body*.

R O M. If the Other Proofs do not make the Matter more Clear, I shall indeed be Tempted to *Suspect*, that we may be in the *Wrong* as to this Particular.

C O N. And certainly you will find Just Cause to Believe so, when once you have Rightly Con-

sider'd them. The next Proof is that of *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 23, &c. where telling us what he had *Receiv'd of the Lord Himself* concerning this *Sacrament*, he shews First, How *Jesus took Bread*; then, how He did *Consecrate, Break, and Deliver the Same* to be *Eaten* by his Disciples; lastly, that at the Delivery of it He said, *This is My Body*. And if the *Bread* was now *Chang'd* into the *Real Substance* of *Christ's Body*, it could not be *Unknown* to *St. Paul*, because the *Lord* was his *Immediate Instructor*.

But Certain it is, *No* such Matter was yet *Reveal'd* to the great Apostle: For then he would not, after all this, have *Call'd* it by the Common Name of *Bread*; but by the *Name* of that *Sacred Thing* into which it was *Changed*. Do you think, He would *Then* have *Dar'd* to make use of *That Word*, which was so *Likely* to become a *Rock of Stumbling* to Many? He very well *Knew*, how *Apt* *Bad Men* would be to *Pervert* the *Faith*; and can you *Imagine*, that He would *then* have put such *Plausible Arguments Against* it into Their *Mouths*? This is most *Incredible*. And therefore when *St. Paul* calls it *Bread*, even *After* it was both *Consecrated and Given*, (as he does no less than *Three* Several times in the *Same* very *Chapter*, *Ver.* 26, 27, 28.) He could not *Believe* it to be *so Chang'd* into the *Substance* of that *Blessed Body*: Nor can *We* be any more *Hereticks*, than *He* was, in *Maintaining* it to be *Bread* still.

ROM. I cannot *Conceive* indeed, that the *Apostle* would have *Call'd* it *Bread*, unless he had *Believ'd* it to *Be* so still. But that which holds me *now* in the greatest *Doubt*, is what I find in the next and last *Proof*; where tho' he *Calls* it *Bread* again, yet he adds *something*, which must

must Imply it to be no less than the very *Body* of Christ.

CON. Pray, read out that Proof.

ROM. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? 1 Cor. x. 16.* Now if the *Bread* be not *Chang'd* into that very *Body*, how can the *Breaking* of it be a *Communion* (or *Partaking*) of the *Same Body*?

CON. The Apostle saith also, in the very same Verse, *The Cup of Blessing, which we Bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?* And therefore I ask you again, If the *Cup* be not *Chang'd* into this very *Blood*, How can the *Drinking* of it be a *Communion* (or *Partaking*) of the *Same Blood*? Certainly, *These Words* are no less *True*, than the *Former*: And *They* yield the very same Proof for a *Substantial Change* of the *Cup*, as the *Former* do for that of the *Bread*. But this *Change of the Cup*, is so Absurd a Doctrine, that you will not pretend to Own it.

And thus I Answer to your Question; The *Same Way*, that the *Drinking of the Cup* is a *Communion* of the *Blood* of Christ, the *Breaking of the Bread* is also a *Communion* of his *Body*: And if the *Communion* of the *Blood* does not Imply any *Change* of the *Substance* of the *Cup*, neither does the *Communion* of the *Body* of Christ Imply any *Change* of the *Substance* of the *Bread*. Without any Such *Change* of either, the *Eating of that Bread*, and *Drinking of that Cup*, is therefore a *True Communion* of the *Body and Blood* of Christ: And every *Worthy Communicant*, by *Partaking* of the *Outward Elements*, is by God's Grace made *Partaker* likewise of all the *Benefits* Obtain'd by the

the *Breaking of Christ's Body, and the Shedding of his Blood upon the Cross.* And now, I hope, you are *Convinc'd* by the Force of your own very *Proofs*, that there can be no such *Change* of the *Symbols of Bread or Wine* into the *Substance of Christ's Blessed Body and Blood.*

R O M. I must Confess, I am almost Persuaded to Believe so.

C O N. Well then; to *Settle your Faith* in this great Point, I will add Two or Three Arguments more. The first shall be from Scripture; and the Words are our Saviour's, who saith, *Ye have the Poor always with you, but Me ye have not always.* Mat. xxvi. 11. Now this he could not speak of any Other than his *Bodily Presence*: For he would be *Always Present* with them in his *Spirit*, as he did elsewhere Promise them; and his Discourse, at this time, was about his Body, which the Woman had now *Anointed* in order to its *Barial*. In this *Body*, He tells them, They should *not have him Always*. But according to this Doctrine, He may Easily be made *Always Present* upon Earth, even the *Whole Living Jesus* with his *Bodily Presence*. For before One *Waser* is gone, Another may be *Consecrated*: And so He may, *with all his Flesh and Bones*, be Entirely *Contain'd* in a *Pyx*, as well as in *Heaven*, until the *times of the Restitution of all Things.*

R O M. This Consequence indeed, to me, seems Plain and Natural. And methinks, it should *Never* be in the *Power* of any One, to make *His Sayings False* who is Himself the *Word of Truth*. But What's your next Argument?

C O N.

CON. My next Argument shall be Grounded upon the *Experience* of our *Senses*. For our *Senses* were given us by God, that They might be so many *Helps* to our *Understanding*: And it is even Impossible that *They* should *Deceive* us when their *Faculties* are *Good*, and when such an *Object*, as a *True Humane Body* is, comes within their *Reach*. But now, if we have Recourse to *Them*, we shall find nothing like such a *Body* in this *Sacrament*: For, We *See* it; We *Feel* it; We *Smell* it; We *Taste* it; and by *All These* it appears, that What we Receive is *Bread and Wine*, without the least *Change* of the *Substance* of either.

If you will not allow Men to *Judge* according to their *Senses*, how can They have any *Affurance*, that those things are *True*, which are most Certainly *Believ'd* among them? The *Credibility* of the Whole Doctrine of Christianity does so far depend upon the *Testimony* of our *Senses*, that no Man ever found any *Ordinary Means* to Believe the Least part of it, but what he had either by *Seeing*, or *Hearing*. If Men might have *Disbeliev'd* their own *Senses*, when they *Heard* Christ *Preaching*, or when they *Saw* those great *Miracles* that he did to Confirm his Doctrine: If they might still have *Doubted* whether He *Spake* such Words, after the *Sound* of Them was come to their *Ears*; Or if they might have *Suspected* the Reality of what He Wrought, when all was so *Plainly* done before their *Eyes*: If they were so likely to be *Deceiv'd* in either of these *Cases*, then how could our Saviour have found so great *Faith upon Earth*?

Our Blessed Saviour Himself, when some of his Disciples were *Doubting* of the *Reality* of his Humane Body after his Resurrection, chose an *Appeal to their Senses* as the most *Probable Argument*

ment to Convince Them. Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my Self; Handle me, and See me; for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as ye see Me have. Luk. xxiv. 39. The Testimony of the Same Senses is much Urg'd by St. John also to prove the Truth and Certainty of Christ's being in the Flesh. That which we have Heard, which we have Seen with our Eyes, which we have look'd upon, and our Hands have Handled of the Word of Life; that which we have Seen and Heard, Declare we unto you. 1 Joh. i. 1, 3. And surely now, These were no Trifling Arguments, which both our Saviour and St. John Used to Convince Men. If therefore the Senses must be acknowledged as a Sufficient Testimony in these Two great Articles of our Christian Faith, why should They not be the Same in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Or why should we be Compell'd to Believe, that Christ's Natural Body and Blood is there, when we See, Feel, Smell, and Taste nothing but Bread and Wine?

R O M. This Argument, I must now own, is not so very Contemprible, as some would make it to be.

C O N. My last Argument shall be drawn from Reason. For this Doctrine of your's must needs imply many Intolerable Contradictions and Absurdities. For as Christ has but One Natural Body, so This will make that Self-same Body to be at the Same very time in Many Places vastly Distant from Each Other; to be, at the very same time, both Broken, and not Broken; to be, at the very same time, both Greater and Less than it Self, &c.

R O M.

R O M. That Christ has but *One Natural Body*, We do all acknowledge: But yet we do not think, that any such *Absurd Consequences* will follow from hence.

C O N. Pray, how will you do to avoid *Them*?

R O M. My Paper tells you, in these Words of the next Article: *Christ is not Present in this Sacrament, according to his Natural way of Existence, that is, with Extention of Parts, in order to Place, &c. but after a Suppernatural manner, One and the Same in Many Places, and whole in every Part of the Symbols.*

C O N. And what Proofs, I beseech you, are there for this?

R O M. None at all, I confess.

C O N. No wonder, surely: For what *Scripture* can there be for a thing most *Plainly False and Absurd*? Can any thing be more *So*, than to Affirm, That Christ is *Present in this Sacrament with his Whole True Natural Body*, and yet *Not according to His Natural Way of Existence*? Can any *True Natural Body Exist* any Other, than a *True Natural, Way*? But I shall take no more Pains to *Confute This*, than your Author has to *Prove it*; and Only Refer you to those Excellent Books in the Margin *, in which you may see this Doctrine sufficiently *Baffled and Exposed*.

* *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented. Ch. 5th. The Absolute Impossibility of Transubstantiation Demonstrated. Edit. 2^d. Pag. 18, &c.*

R C M. Speak now to the 9th Article: *Neither is the Body of Christ in this Holy Sacrament, Separated from his Blood, or his Blood from his Body, or Either of both Disjoyn'd from his Soul and Divinity; but All and Whole Living Jesus is Entirely Contain'd under Either Species; so that whosoever Receives under One Kind, is Truly Partaker of the Whole Sacrament, and no wise Depriv'd either of the Body or Blood of Christ.*

C O N. This Sacrament was instituted for a Memorial or Representation of the Sacrifice of Christ for the Forgiveness of our Sins. And therefore, as the Sacrifice it self was not perform'd without a Separation of the Body and Blood of Christ at his Passion, so neither can We Perfectly Remember or Represent it in this Sacrament, without making such a Separation too. And Plain it is, That Christ Himself did appoint the Receiving of his Body and Blood as Two Separate things. First He took the Bread, and said, *Take, Eat, This is My Body which is Broken for you; This do in Remembrance of Me.* 1 Cor. xi. 24. Then after the same manner he took the Cup, and gave the very same Commandment concerning it, saying, *This do, as oft as ye Drink it, in Remembrance of Me.* Ver. 25. And so, the Body of Christ in this Sacrament, (which way soever it be Receiv'd,) was, by His Own Order, both of Example and Precept, Separated from his Blood, and his Blood from his Body: The Body and Blood were not Both at Once Given; but Distinctly and Successively, apart the One from the Other; the Body First, together with the Symbol of Bread, and Then the Blood, together with the Cup.

R O M.

R O M. But you should Consider, *That the Body and Blood of Christ are not either of Them Disjoyn'd from His Soul and Divinity; But All and Whole Living Jesus is Entirely Contain'd under Either Species.*

C O N. Consider, say you? Truly, This Doctrine draws after it so Sad a Consequence, that I e'en Tremble to Think on't. For if *All and Whole Living Jesus* (not only *Body and Blood, but Soul and Divinity* too) be so *Entirely Contain'd under Either Species*; Then should the most *Profligate Wretch*, or *Vilest Sinner*, Presume to Come, and *Receive Either Species*, even He shall wirth it also *Receive Christ Himself, as well God as Man*: And being thus made a *Receptacle* of the most *Holy One*, the *Lord of Life* shall *Dwell in Him*, notwithstanding he *Be the very Worst of Reprobates.*

R O M. Well; but if Men come *Worthily* to this *Holy Sacrament*, then sure no such *Dismal Consequence* can be in it: And *Whosoever Receives under One Kind only is truly Partaker of the Whole Sacrament*, and no wise *Depriv'd either of the Body or Blood of Christ.*

C O N. There are Several very *Ill Consequences* of this *Affertion* too. For it will follow, That *Christ did Institute Both Kinds* to very little Purpose; and that, because the *Whole Sacrament* might as well have been *Given in One alone*, therefore the *Other* was *Superfluous*: That the *Apostles*, to whom He gave it, *Receiv'd All and Whole Christ* at the *Delivery of the Bread*; and so They could have no farther *Benefit* by *Partaking of the Cup*: And That your *Own Priests*

I

may

may now make a *True Sacrament* without Consecrating Both the Elements; or at least, That They may be Truly and Sufficiently Partakers of it, as well as the People, without the Receiving of Both. Such are the Consequences of this Doctrine; and therefore Little is to be Expected from your Proofs.

R O M. How will you Answer this then? *Joh. vi. 48, 50, 51, 57, 58.* where our Saviour saith, *I am that Bread of Life. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may Eat thereof, and not Die. I am the Living Bread, which came down from Heaven: If any Man Eat of this Bread, he shall Live for Ever: And the Bread that I will give, is My Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World. He that Eateth Me, even he shall Live by Me. This is that Bread which came down from Heaven. He that Eateth of this Bread, shall Live for Ever.* Now all along, our Saviour speaking of the Bread alone, calls it Himself, and his Flesh; and affirms, that *Whosoever does but Eat of this Bread, shall not Die, but have Eternal Life:* And so it is Manifest, that He who Communicates in this One Kind only, shall have the Benefit of the Whole Sacrament without the Least Deprivation.

C O N. If our Saviour, in this Discourse, did speak of *Sacramental Eating*, then I have from hence an Undeniable Proof, That the Body and Blood of Christ are Separated from each Other in this Sacrament; and that Whosoever Receives but in One Kind, cannot be Truly a Partaker of them Both. This you may find in the 53^d Verse, the middle Part of the same Continued Discourse, which your Paper seems to have Designedly Omitted.

ted. There our Saviour requires *Two Distinct and Separate Acts*; Both the Eating of his *Flesh*, and the Drinking of his *Blood*; and makes them *Both Equally Necessary to Salvation likewise*. His Words are these, *Except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* The Body and Blood of Christ therefore must be *Two Distinct and Separate Things*, because the *Actions* by which they are Receiv'd; are *Distinct and Separate*, and cannot be *Perform'd* by the same Person at the same Instant of Time. And because Our Saviour Declares, that *They have no Life in them*, Who are not *Partakers* of his Body and Blood, *Both by Eating the One, and by Drinking the Other*, it must follow, That *They who Receive under the One Kind of Eating only, are most Miserably Depriv'd of the Other.*

ROM. But sure you will not Think so, when you Consider the next Proof, which is *Act. ii. 42.* For this shews, that the Primitive Christians Receiv'd but in *One Kind, Communicating only by the Breaking of Bread.*

CON. This was spoken no Otherwise than by way of *Figure*; and Both the *Sacramental Actions* (Eating and Drinking too) were Included in it. For what They now did, was with an Especial *Eye of Obedience* to their Blessed Saviour: And He did as much *Oblige* Them to the One, as to the Other. This was His Direct Precept to Them, *Drink ye All of it.* Mat. xxvi. 27. And surely Those Good Christians would not Neglect or Forget what Their Dear Lord had so lately Commanded, at the same very time when They were Doing this in Remembrance of Him.

R O M. But how can that *Command Concern the People*? Christ gave it to *None* but the *Apostles*: For *None* but the *Apostles* were with him at *That Time*.

C O N. There is *Mention* indeed of *None* but the *Twelve* then with Him: And will you therefore *Positively Affirm*, that there were *No more*? Were *None* of *All his Other Constant Followers* with Him at the *Institution of this Sacrament*? Was not so much as the *Blessed Virgin Mary* Admitted to it?

But, suppose *She*, and *All the Rest* were *Excluded*; and that the *Command, Drink ye All of it*, was *Given Only to the Apostles*; What then will be the *Consequence* but this, that the *Other Command of Christ also, Take, Eat*, was *Given to Them Only*, and *Concern'd None but Them*? And so, the *Whole Command* being *Given to Them as Pastors of the Church Only*, the *People* at last will be under *No Obligation to Receive any Part of this Sacrament from the Institution and Command of Christ*.

R O M. Now you talk of our *Saviour's Institution of This*, what say you to the next *Article*, wherein is *Shewn*, that *He at his last Supper, Instituted not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice; a Commemorative Sacrifice Distinctly shewing His Death and Bloody Passion, until He come*.

C O N. And what *Proofs* do you find for this *Sacrifice*?

R O M. The first is *Luk. xxii. 19, &c.* where Our *Saviour* affirms of his *Body*, that it [*Is*] *Given*; and of his *Blood*, that it [*Is*] *Shed, in this Sacrament*.

C O N.

CON. I must now ask again: Which way will you *Interpret* these Words? In a *Literal*, or in a *Figurative* Sense? If in a *Literal*, then, since Christ here Speaks of not only his *Body* as *Actually Given*, but of his *Blood* also as *Actually Shed*, it must follow, that He did then *Offer up* Himself a *Bloody Sacrifice*, even whilst He was yet *Alive*: And then your *Own* must be a *Bloody Sacrifice* too, if it be *Like His*. Both these *Horrid Consequences* must Unavoidably *Ensue* upon the *Literal Construction* of the Words.

But if you lay aside the *Letter*, and come to our *Figurative* Way of *Interpreting* Them, then you must even lay aside your *Whole Argument* from this Text: And I desire no more than this, to *Confute* your New *Phantastical Notion* of such a *True and Proper Sacrifice*, as your Church Maintains.

ROM. The next is that of St. Paul, *As oft as ye Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he Come.* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

CON. And is it not most *Absurd*, to say, that *Shewing the Lord's Death is Sacrificing the Lord Himself*? To *Shew* can signifie no more than to *Declare*, *Represent*, or *Commemorate* the *Oblation* of that *Sacrifice*: And what can be more *Irrational*, than to *Assert*, that such a *Declaration*, *Representation*, or *Commemoration* of a Thing Done, is Really the *Doing* of it?

ROM. The third Proof is *Heb. xiii. 10.* *We have an Altar.* And if so, then we must needs have a *Sacrifice* too: For, what signifieth an *Altar* without a *Sacrifice*?

CON. Some Learned Men suppose, that no *Material Altar* is here meant, but *Christ Himself only*, by whom we *Offer up Spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God*. And this they ground upon the 15^m Verse of the same Chapter; as also upon *St. Peter*, 1 *Ep.* ii. 5; in both which Places no less is affirm'd. But from this Interpretation of a *Spiritual Altar*, you can by no means infer such a *Corporeal Sacrifice*.

Others no less Learned by this *Altar* Understand the *Communion-Table*, upon which the Bread and Wine were *Offered*. And the *Offering* of These upon the Holy Table, to Represent and Commemorate the Propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ, they assert to be a *True and Real Sacrifice*. But this will do you no Service: And the Asserters of this have sufficiently Confuted *your Notion* of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist.

ROM. But still my Paper goes on: *Jesus is here Given, not only TO Us, but FOR Us; and the Church thereby Enrich'd with a True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice, Usually term'd Mass.*

CON. To prove that Christ is Given *FOR Us in the Eucharist*, your Paper has no other Text but that of *St. Luke*, (xxii. 19.) to which you have had my Answer already. And to shew, that the Church is *Enrich'd thereby with such a Sacrifice, it produceth. Mal. i. 11.* which I shall now Consider.

The Words then are these: *From the Rising of the Sun, even unto the Going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in Every Place Incense shall be Offered to My Name, and a Pure Offering.* Now it cannot be Denied, that the *Offering*, of which the Prophet here speaks,

speaks, was to be perform'd under the Gospel. But what then? Must it therefore needs Signifie the *Sacrifice of Christ's Natural Body and Blood in the Eucharist*? If indeed you could prove any such Sacrifice in It, then these Words might very well be *Applied* thereunto. But they cannot *Themselves* be a *Sufficient Proof* of it, because *They mention No Particular Offering*. Every Christian *Sacrifice*, whether it be that of *Prayer, Praise, &c.* (which we Often find so call'd in Scripture,) is a *Pure Offering*, it Rightly perform'd. And the Prophet speaks here in the *General*, Comprehending *Every Kind of Holy Oblation*, and Fore-telling in *Gross* What a *Pure Worship and Spiritual Service* the very Gentiles should one Day yield unto God in all Places. And so you see, how little your *True, Proper, Propitiatory Sacrifice*, usually term'd *Mass*, is Grounded upon Scripture. Your Church indeed is *vastly Enrich'd* by this Doctrine, and therefore *She* will not part with it, though it be most *Contradictory* to the Scripture it Self.

R O M. How! *Contradictory* to Scripture! Sure, That's to be Prov'd yet.

C O N. Your Doctrine, I say, of *such a Sacrifice* is *Contradictory* to Divers of the Plainest Texts that we have in Scripture: And this I will Evince by Two or Three Undeniable *Instances*. For First, *Without Shedding of Blood, there is No Remission*. Heb. ix. 22. But you Confess, That in your *Mass* there is *No Shedding of the Blood of Christ*; and therefore in It there can be *No such Proper Propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ for the Remission* (or Forgiveness) of Sins.

Again, Ver. 25, 26. *Christ doth not Offer Himself Often, as the High Priest entreth into the Holy Place*

Place every Year with the Blood of Others; for then must He Often have Suffer'd since the Foundation of the World. In which Words we have, 1st, A Plain Proposition, viz. *Christ is not Often Offer'd, or Sacrificed.* 2^{dly}, A Proof of it by this Inference, Then He must Often have Suffer'd: And so I Argue thus upon them. *Christ cannot be Offer'd a True and Proper Sacrifice Without Suffering: But in your Mass Christ is not made to Suffer: (you will not Dare to say that sure,) Therefore in your Mass, Christ cannot be Offer'd a True and Proper Sacrifice.*

Lastly; *That Sacrifice, which being Once Offered, is Able to make the Comers thereunto Perfect, should Cease afterwards to be Offered any more: But the Sacrifice of Christ, being Once Offer'd is Able to make the Comers thereunto Perfect; Therefore the Sacrifice of Christ should Cease afterwards to be Offer'd any more.*

Now, if All this be True, then your Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass stands Condemn'd from the very time of His being Offer'd upon the Cross. But the Major is most Plainly made out by the Apostle, Heb. x. 1, 2. Where speaking of the Legal Sacrifices, which were Offer'd Year by Year Continually, he tells Us in Express Terms, that, *if They could have made the Comers thereunto Perfect, Then They would have Ceased to be Offer'd.* And if you have any Doubt of the Minor, you may see that no less Evidently Prov'd in the very same Chapter. For Ver. 10. the Apostle tells us, that *We are Sanctified through the Offering of the Body of Jesus Christ ONCE for all:* And again, Ver. 14. *By ONE Offering he hath Perfected, FOR EVER, them that are Sanctified.*

ROM. I must Confess, you are too Hard for me in this Point. But what say you to the next? *Catholicks Renounce all Divine Worship and Adoration of Images or Pictures. God alone we Worship and Adore.*

CON. Sure this is too good News to be True. I shall be *Exceeding Glad* to see This well made out. Pray, what Proofs do you find for it?

ROM. But One indeed, which is This: *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him Only shalt thou serve.* Luk. iv. 8.

CON. Ay; This Text does *sufficiently* shew, What you ought to Do; but will no more Prove that you Do it, than that the Devil Himself Does the same, to whom the Words were Directed by our Blessed Saviour.

ROM. My Paper grants; *We make Use of Pictures, and place them in Churches and Oratories to Reduce our Wandring Thoughts, and Enliven our Memories towards Heavenly things.*

CON. And do you indeed Use them with no other Intention? Or, are they set up in your Churches for no Other End? Then a bare Looking upon them may Suffice. For all that an Image or Picture can Contribute towards the Reducing Our Wandring Thoughts, or the Enlivening of our Memories, is done by Representing the Prototype (or that which it Resembles,) to our Sight. And yet you do not think it Enough, to View and Contemplate your Images, but (if you are Conformable to your Venerable Council of Trent, Sess. 25.) you Uncover your Heads, and even Prostrate your Bodies

Bodies before Them. And what can you do more, as to *Outward Worship*, in the *Presence of God Himself*? How can you possibly appear, *Before Him*, in a more *Humble Posture of Adoration*? Surely, we may well say that you *Worship Images*, when you not only *Set Them up in your Places of Religious Worship*, but most *Solemnly Consecrate Them*, *Fall down, and Kneel Before Them*, as you do *Before the Lord your Maker*.

ROM. But for all this, I say, *We do not Worship Them*.

CON. And then, I say, you *Disobey your Own very Church*. For *She* requires, that you *should Worship Them*. And in Her *Catechism* (I mean that, which was *Publish'd by One of your Popes according to the Especial Order and Direction of the said Council of Trent*, in that) *She doth Enjoyn her Pastors to Teach the People*, That these *Images* are set up in your Churches, even (*ut * Colantur*) that they may be *Worshipped*. This also many of your greatest Divines have Contended for: And to Prove this, They have insisted upon some of those very Texts, which I find in the Margin of your Paper. They urge that of *Exod. xxv. 18.* where God commanded *Moses to make two Cherubims for the Mercy Seat*: And that of the *1 King. vi. 35.* where *Solomon likewise Carv'd the same to be plac'd in the Temple*. And yet they cannot shew, that *These* were ever *Worshipped in the least*; Or that *These* were so much as *Seen by the People*. And indeed 'tis very Probable, that the *People never Saw Them*. For these *Cherubims* were set

* Cat. Rom. Par. 3. Cap. 2.

within the *Inner House*, 1 King. vi. 27. even in the *Holiest of all*, Heb. ix. 3, 5. into which Place None but the High Priest was to Enter, and that but Once a Year. Ver. 7.

They urge again that of *Numb. xxi. 8.* where the Lord said unto *Moses*, *Make thee a Fiery Serpent, and Set it upon a Pole; and it shall come to pass, that every One that is Bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall Live.* And yet, when the People *Worshipp'd* this Image by *Burning Incense* to it, King *Hezekiah* brake it down, though God Himself had Commanded it to be Set up. And this Fact is so far *Approv'd* in Scripture, that immediately upon the Relation of it, we find him Recorded for having *Done that which was Right in the Sight of the Lord*; and that *After him None was Like him among all the Kings of Judah, nor any that were before Him.* 2 King. xviii. 3, 4, 5.

ROM. You may save your Self the Trouble of Confuting this *Image-Worship*, either on the Author's, or My Account. For as his Paper has *Renounc'd* it, so do I: And all the Use that I make of any *Picture or Image*, is to *Reduce my Wandring Thoughts*, and to *Enliven my Memory towards Heavenly things*. And what Hurt can there be in This?

CON. I will allow, that you may *Innocently Look upon the Picture or Image of any Saint*: And if the Sight of it can *Fix your Thoughts* upon, or Recall your *Mind* to the Contemplation of any Heavenly Vertues that were in him, 'tis so much the Better. But when you come to an Image with *Humble Reverence*, *Bowing your Body*, or *Bending your Knees* before it, even in the Place of *Worship*, and By It also *Worshipping the Person*
whom

whom it Represents; in This you are still Exceeding Sinful, tho' both your Inward Intention be Not to Worship it, and you Openly Renounce the Practice of it too. For God hath Expressly Forbidden, not only the Worshipping of Images, but also the Bowing down to Them. So *Exod. xx. 5.* Thou shalt not Bow down thy Self to Them. And so again, *Levit. xxvi. 1.* Ye shall not rear you up a standing Image, neither shall ye set up any Image of Stone in your Land, to Bow down unto it; for I am the Lord your God.

R O M. Right: These Texts do plainly Forbid Bowing [To] an Image. But We are not Guilty of This: We only Bow Before it.

C O N. How then can you [By It] pay any Worship or Honour to the Person whom it Represents; if you do not Bow [To] it also? You may Equivocate and Distinguish as you please; but I will tell you, that Bowing [To] and [Before] an Image, is One and the Same very Thing, when you Direct your Selves to it as Such a Representing Object. This has been sufficiently Prov'd by Two Learned Writers * here Refer'd to, which I entreat you to Read at your Leisure. And all that I shall add, is this Observation from One of the Prophets: That when the Jewish Priest Minister'd unto the People [Before] their Idols, They caused the House of Israel to Fall into Iniquity; and so much was God Provok'd by this, that he Lift up his Hand against them, and caus'd them to

[* Answer to the Papists Protesting, &c. Pag. 81. Answer to the first Sheets of the Second Part of the Papist Mis-Rep. and Rep. Pag. 11.

bear their Iniquity. Ezek. xliv. 12. Now, how could they be so Exceeding Guilty in doing this [Before] their Idols, unless it was, in Construction with God, a doing it [To] them also? Or how can you shew, that any Service [Before] an Idol is Sinful, but by Reducing it to those Commands which Forbid the yielding any such thing [To] it, and by making Both to be the Same? And then, if their Ministering [Before] Idols, was the Same as Ministering [To] them; why should not also your Bowing [Before] Images, be the Same as Bowing [To] Them?

R O M. Sure, there is a very great Difference between those *Idols* and our *Images*.

C O N. Why; you *Bow before your Images, as They are Objects of Representation*: And certainly these Jews thought their *Idols* to be no more. They could not be so *Stupid* as to think *They* were *Gods*, which they so well knew to be the *Work of Mens Hands*.

R O M. But perhaps *They* might be *Representations of False Gods*.

C O N. Well: *Most of your Images are Representations of Them that are No Gods*: And so, what mighty Difference is there between Them?

R O M. Perhaps yet, *They* might *Believe* there was some *Divinity* or *Virtue* in those *Idols*: But we altogether *Declare* against it, as to our *Images*. 'Tis True, (and my Paper here tells you so,) *We allow a Certain Honour and Veneration to the Picture of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, &c. Beyond what is Due to Every Prophane Figure; but not that*

we Believe any Divinity or Virtue in the Pictures Themselves, for which they ought to be Honoured.

CON. But you Allow a Greater Honour and Veneration to the Picture of Christ, than to any Other; as also to the Figures of the Virgin Mary, and of Some Saints, [Beyond] what you give to Those of Other Saints. And what Reason have you for this, if you do not Believe, that there is more Divinity or Virtue in the One than in the Other?

ROM. The Reason you have in the next Words of my Paper, viz. *Because the Honour Given to the Picture, is Referr'd to the Prototype, or thing Represented.*

CON. Believe me, I cannot Understand this Reason.

ROM. Then I will make it more Plain to you by this particular Instance. Christ is more to be Honour'd than any Saint: And therefore His Image or Picture should have More Honour, because the Honour Given to It, is Referr'd to Christ Himself, the Prototype, Represented by It.

CON. Now the Honour which you first Give to the Image or Picture of Christ, and then [By It] Refer to Christ Himself the Prototype, is either True Divine Honour, or Less than Divine. If Less: Then you Refer to Christ Himself, Less than his Due Honour, because the Same Honour Given to the One is Referr'd to the Other; and Less than Divine Honour is Less than His Due. That you thus Rob Christ of His Due Honour, you will not say. And therefore if [By His Image or Picture]

ture] you Refer Due Honour to Him, you must first Give it to That, by which it is Referr'd. And so you Give Divine Honour (which is Divine Worship and Adoration,) to the Image or Picture of Christ in your Practice, tho' you Renounce it in your Words. And now let me see, whether you have any more Proofs for this part of the Article, than those already Consider'd.

ROM. I see but Two more, which are both out of the New Testament. The first is, *Luk. iii. 22. And the Holy Ghost Descended in a Bodily Shape, like a Dove, upon Him; and a Voice came from Heaven, which said, Thou art my Beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleas'd.* The Other is, *Act. v. 15. They brought forth the Sick into the Streets, and laid them on Beds and Couches, that at the least the Shadow of Peter passing by, might Over-shadow some of them.*

CON. These are fine Proofs indeed. They will not Both of them yield the Least Shadow of an Argument; and therefore I dismiss them without any Remark.

ROM. Have you any thing to Object against the next Article? *There is a Kind of Honour and Veneration respectively Due to the Bible, &c.*

CON. As this Article is Worded, I see Little in it very Liable to Exception. For doubtless, there is a Kind of Honour Due to All Sacred Things and Persons, any way Relating or Appertaining to God. And, as your Paper goes on: *To whom Honour is Due, Honour may be Given without any Derogation to the Majesty of God, or that Divine Worship Appropriate to Him.* So long therefore as

you keep your Selves within these Bounds, Giving Them *Only* the Honour *Respectively* Due to Them, you shall be *Free* from my Censure.

ROM We are now come to the last Article: *Catholicks Believe, That the Blessed Saints in Heaven Replenish'd with Charity, Pray for us their Fellow-Members here on Earth; That They Rejoyce at our Conversion; That Seeing God, They See and Know in Him all things Suitable to Their Happy State; That God is Inclenable to Hear Their Requests made in our Behalf, and for Their Sakes grants us many Favours; That therefore it is Good and Profitable to Desire Their Intercession.*

CON. Here your *Praying to Saints* is Grounded upon Several *Premises*, which (if I should Grant them to be *All True*) will prove Nothing for it. For, what tho' the *Saints in Heaven Pray for us*? What tho' God be *Inclenable to Hear their Prayers, and Grants us Many Favours for Their Sakes*? What tho' They *Rejoyce at our Conversion*? Is this a *Sufficient Reason* for the *Solemn Invocation* of Them? If it is, then we may as well *Address* our Selves, *after the same Manner*, to the Saints on Earth. For doubtless, *THESE* also are *Replenish'd with so much Charity as to PRAY for Us*: God has *Promis'd to Hear the Devout Prayers of THESE*: He *Grants Us Many Favours for the Sake of THESE*: And lastly, *THESE have great Rejoycing to See the Conversion of a Sinner*, as well as the *Blessed Saints in Heaven*. And Why then may not the Argument be as Good on the One Side, as on the Other?

ROM. You do not Consider, That *They Know our Wants and Necessities Better than These on Earth.*

CON.

CON. That's very Strange indeed! Why; We have *Many Ways of Communicating* our Wants to *These*, but *None* of doing it to *Them*: And unless *They* are Like God Himself, in *All Places Present*, or *Seeing All Things*, how is it Possible that *They* should *Know* them?

ROM. You might have Known how; if you had not Over-look'd these Words: *Seeing God, They See and Know in Him in all things suitable to Their Happy State.*

CON. Is it then any *Part* of Their Happiness; to *See or Know the Wants, Necessities, and Miseries of Their Fellow-Members* here on Earth? Certainly, *They* may be *Happy Enough* in Heaven *without This.*

ROM. Whether *They* may, or not, is not so very *Material* to the Point in Question. 'Tis Sufficient if *They* have *Knowledge* of the things *Below*: Which, I think, is *Prov'd* by this Text in the Margin, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. *Now we see through a Glass Darkly, but then Face to Face: Now I Know in Part, but then shall I Know even as also I am Known.*

CON. But this Text does not afford the *Least Proof* of any such Matter. For it *Only* speaks of that *Perfect Sight and Knowledge of God*, which the *Blessed Saints* shall have in the *Other World*; and not of any *Sight or Knowledge*, which *They there* have of the *Particular Affairs of This*. And this you may learn from your *Own very Commentators.*

R O M. But what can you say to the Text plac'd immediately before? *I say unto you, that likewise Joy shall be in Heaven over One Sinner that Repenteth, &c. Luk. xv. 7.*

C O N. These Words are the Conclusion and Application of the Parable of the *Lost Sheep*. And here the *Person Rejoycing is the Owner* of the *Sheep*, after he had found it with much *Seeking*. Now, *Man* is the Creature, who has *Erred* and *Strayed* like a *Lost Sheep*: The *Shepherd*, that goes after him, until He hath found him, is God or Christ: And when He hath found him, then he bringeth him back to his own home with *Rejoycing*. And so the plain Design of this *Parable* is to shew, how many Ways God seeks the Conversion of a Sinner, and how much (not the Saints, but) He Rejoyceth at it.

R O M. This perhaps might be *Principally* intended by the *Parable*: Yet still you will find there, not only the *Man Rejoycing*, who had found his *Sheep*, but his *Friends and Neighbours* too: And who are the *Friends and Neighbours* of God in Heaven, but the Blessed Saints and Angels?

C O N. Well: How does it appear from hence, that it is *Good and Profitable to Desire Their Intercession*?

R O M. What! Can't you See that? Why; They must *Know* of the Sinner's *Repentance*, before they can *Rejoyce* at it: And if so, then, by the same Reason, They may *Know* when he *Prays* to Them: And then the Consequence will be Clear, That it is *Good and Profitable to Desire Their Intercession*.

C O N.

CON. But indeed it appears far *Otherwise* to Me. For as the *Friends and Neighbours*, in the Parable, did not *Know* that the *Sheep* was found, till the *Owner* Himself *Call'd* them together, and *Told* them of it: So, according to this Proof, neither can the *Saints* in Heaven *Know* of the Conversion of a Sinner, but by *Revelation* from God. And since, according to your Own Argument, it is the *same* Way that They come to the *Knowledge of his Prayers*, 'tis very Manifest, That God has *Heard* them, *before* They *Know* them; That Christ, the great *Mediator between God and Men*, has already *Presented* them to the *Father*: And therefore, if the *Merit* of His Intercession be *Sufficient* to Prevail for the Sinner's Pardon and Acceptance, How should it *Now* be *Good and Profitable* for him, *To beg* Their Intercession? Surely, *After His Prayer is Heard, After Christ Himself has Appear'd in the Presence of God for him*, No farther *Benefit or Advantage* can be found from the *Saints Intercession*.

ROM. But surely, we may as *Innocently Desire* Their Intercession, as we may *Beg* the Prayers of one another in this World.

CON. Do you think then that there is so *small a Difference* between them? Certainly you cannot. For, when you *Desire* the *Saints in Heaven* to *Pray for you*, you *Address* your selves to Them in the most *Humble Posture of Adoration*, with *Bended Knees, with Hands and Eyes Lift up to Them*, in a *Set Form of Devotion*, at a *Set Hour of Prayer*, and in *Places Set apart for Religious Worship*; and so your Prayer to Them can be no *Less* than *Religious*. But when we *Beg* the Prayers of *One another in this World*, We do it
not

not with any *Circumstance* either of *Gesture*, *Words*, *Time*, or *Place*, that can make it look like a *Religious Action*. And therefore *This* cannot so Properly be call'd *Prayer*, as a *Civil Request*. May not even *this* then be Sufficient to shew the *Weakness* of your *Comparison*, and the *Falseness* of your *Assertion*?

But in the next place, your *Praying after this Manner to the Saints in Heaven*, is Directly Contrary to the *Commandment* of God; whereas our *Asking the Prayers of One another* has His *Approbation*. That your *Praying to the Saints Above*, is a most Direct *Violation* of God's *Commandment*, will be Manifest from all those *Places of Scripture*, where *Divine Worship is Appropriated to God alone*. I shall mention but One at present; *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou Serve*. Mat. iv. 10. Here God has Expressly Commanded, that *No Divine Worship or Service* shall be yielded to any other besides *Himself*: But *Prayer* is the Highest Part of *Divine Worship and Service*: And therefore you plainly Transgress his *Commandment* in *Offering up Prayers to the Saints in Heaven*. But if you desire to be yet more fully Satisfied in this Particular, I will shew you an Excellent Treatise upon the Subject *.

But farther yet: By *Begging the Prayers of our Earthly Brethren*, we do no way Offend against Christ. But by *Praying to the Heavenly Saints for Their Intercession*, you are indeed very *Injurious* to Him. For by this means, you make *Them* to become your *Mediators*, and so you give *Them* a Share in that great Office which PE CU-

* A Discourse concerning the Object of Religious Worship.

LIARLY belongs to Christ. St. Paul plainly shews, that as there is but *One God*, so there is but *ONE MEDIATOR between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*. 1 Tim. ii. 5. And do you not Offer a very great *Injury* to our Blessed Saviour, in setting up *More* against Him?

ROM. No surely: For tho' Christ be our *Only Mediator of Redemption*, yet the *Saints in Heaven* also may be our *Mediators of Intercession*. And I still Believe, with my Paper, that when we Pray to Them as *Such Only*, *This Manner of Invocation* is no more *Injurious* to Christ Our Mediator, than it is for *One Christian* to Beg the Prayers and Assistance of another in this World.

CON. But God has no-where made any such *Distinction of Mediators*: And how then can you Presume to do it against so *Plain a Declaration*, that He hath appointed *but One*?

Well; to Answer you according to your Own Distinction: He that is no more than a *Mediator of Intercession* in the Court of Heaven, must Appear there in the Presence of God for Us; He must Solicit, Move, and Procure the Favour of God towards Us; and that by Virtue of his Own Power, Interest, or Merit. And so 'tis Impossible, that you should make the *Saints Mediators* even of *Intercession*, without Offering great *Injury and Dishonour* to Christ Himself. For this must needs suppose, either that Christ is not *Willing and Ready* at all times, or that He is not *Able and Sufficient of Himself alone*, to do the Office. For to what End should you set up such *Joynt-Mediators* with Christ, if you think that He is *Always* at hand to Receive and Present your Prayers to God; if you think that He is also of *Sufficient Power*
and

and Merit to Obtain, by his *Own Intercession alone*, Whatsoever you Want or can Desire?

As this then is *Highly Injurious* to Christ; so you will be asham'd sure, to Compare it any more with *One Christian's Begging the Prayers of another in this World*. For no Christian certainly ever *Begg'd the Prayers* of another here on Earth, Believing that he should go into the *Immediate Presence* of God in Heaven to Present them. Nor did ever any *Good Christian* ask them, with *Confidence* that They should be Heard as Intercessors, for their *Own Personal Interest, Merit, or Power with God*. We may Beg the Prayers of THESE, without the least *Encroachment* upon the *Peculiar Office and Prerogative* of Christ; without *Reflecting the Least Dishonour* upon His *Person and Merits*: But of both these you are most *Notoriously Guilty* by your *Praying to the Saints in Heaven*.

But let me tell you, there is something *Worse* in this yet. For you do not only *Pray the Saints to Pray for you*, but you many times *Pray Them even to Give you those things, which None but God Himself can Give*; and many times again, in your *Prayers to Them*, you so far *Recognize Their Merits*, as if they were very little *Inferiour* to those of the very *Son of God*. This hath been largely shewn by several: But if you would see it in Short, read the *Ingenious Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*. Pag. 11.

R O M. We are now come to the *Conclusion* of the Whole Matter. And here my Paper shews, that *Notwithstanding all this, We Catholicks are not Taught so to Rely on the Prayers of Others, as to Neglect any of our Own Duties*.

C O N.

CON. This CONCLUSION is Like the greatest part of your Paper, viz. *Manifestly False*. For that *Precious Time*, which you Bestow in *Praying to these Saints*, is *All Lost*, because spent in a *Service* which can never appear to be *Good and Profitable*: And this is no *No small Neglect*. Whilst you are *Doing This*, you must *Unavoidably Neglect*, either some *Known Duty* which you *Owe to God*; or some good *Christian Office*, wherein you might *Serve your Selves and your Neighbours*.

But because I would hasten to a *Conclusion* also; I will suppose, that you do not *Neglect* any of these *Duties*: Yet, since (both in *This*, and many Other Particulars,) you still *Do what you Ought not*; your *Non-Omission* can never *Aton*e for your *Commission*; your *Doing even what God Commands*, can never *Satisfie* for your *Doing what He Forbids*. Nor will it any thing avail you by way of *Excuse*, that your *Church* hath *Taught* you so to *Believe or Practise*, if God Himself hath plainly *Taught* you the *Contrary*. And if you do not *Turn* from every such *Error and Transgression*, your *Damnation* will be *Just*, Because you have *Sufficient Means to Avoid Them*.

I beseech you then, as you *Love your own Soul*, Consider these Things: And let neither the *Hope of Gaining*, nor the *Fear of Losing* any thing in this World, prevail upon you to *Persevere in so Dangerous a State of Christianity*. For, *What will it Profit you, if you shall Gain the Whole World, and Lose your own Soul?*

F I N I S.

By the same AUTHOR.

THE Word of God the Best Guide to
All Persons, at All Times, and in All
Places: Or, A Collection of Scripture-Texts,
plainly shewing such things as are Necess-
ary for Every Christian's Knowledge and
Practice.

The Doctrine of the Trinity Prov'd from
Scripture. A Sermon Preach'd before the
University of *Oxford*, at St. Mary's, on
Sunday, *May 13th. 1711.*



